



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

obliged to quit Barey Woods, the place which she had formed after her own taste, and in which she hoped to die, in consequence of the bad conduct of her servants, who had taken advantage of her great indulgence. But her sisters were dead ; she herself was waiting to follow, and it was of little importance to her where she passed the remaining hours of her closing day. Her powers of body and mind failed after that time, but not so rapidly as might have been expected from a constitution which had never been strong, and was then undermined by sickness added to the infirmity of age. Her disposition was cheerful and even playful to the very last ; we mean the last period of her conscious existence ; for she was brought by successive stages of decline to such a state of helplessness, that her mind almost failed her for a year before her death. Her death was a gentle and willing separation from the living ; when she retired to rest her work was done ; how well done the world has testified by a verdict, which we may hope will be affirmed on high.

ART. X.—Character of Jefferson.

1. *Remarks on Article IX. in the Eighty-Fourth Number of the North American Review, [July, 1834.] entitled Origin and Character of the Old Parties.* 8vo. pp. 39. Boston. 1834.
2. *Life of Thomas Jefferson, with Selections from the most valuable Portions of his Private Correspondence.* By B. L. RAYNER. 12mo. pp. 431. Boston. 1834.

THE first of these writings is intended as a reply to the article on the origin and character of the old political parties, which appeared in the July number of this journal. It is anonymous and carries with it no distinct internal evidence of its origin, but is understood to proceed from the author of the work, entitled Familiar Letters on Public Characters and Events, which formed one of the immediate subjects of that article.

The second of the works now before us is an unpretending but judicious and entertaining Life of Mr. Jefferson, including

some of the most interesting and valuable of his letters. It is written in a favorable though not extravagantly eulogistic strain. We venture to recommend it to the perusal of those who may not have an easy access to the larger works on the subject, and may wish to obtain a different view of Mr. Jefferson's character, from that which has been handed down by tradition from his political opponents, or is recorded in the party pamphlets and journals of his day.

The Remarks on our preceding article, to which we now propose to invite the reader's attention, possess no great intrinsic value of any kind. They are a desultory, hasty, and both in style and substance quite incorrect series of notes upon our former lucubrations. They are in themselves, perhaps, not entitled to notice. But we have thought that for this very reason it might be useful to bring them under review. As the question has been started, it is of some importance to show upon how slight a texture of fact and argument party-spirit has founded its indictment against the fair fame of one of our great public benefactors, — one of the lights of the country and age in which he flourished. In speaking with plainness of the contents of the pamphlet, and in connexion with them of the Familiar Letters, it is not our intention to attribute to the author, — nor did we attribute to him in our former notice of his labors, — any worse motive than that of party-spirit. His pamphlet, like his book, is written in the temper of the publications of the period of the war and the Hartford Convention. He was himself a conspicuous actor in the controversies of that time, and has evidently lost nothing of the zeal with which he then espoused the doctrines, the feelings, the friendships, and the enmities of the party with which he was associated. We are willing to believe that he was then, and is now, entirely honest in his belief, although we cannot but regret that he should have deemed it expedient to envenom our existing political disputes, — already sufficiently acrimonious, — by a renewal of past quarrels, which an obvious policy, as well as the natural promptings of good feeling, should have induced him, as far as lay in his power, to bury in oblivion. As the attempt has been made, we consider it desirable that it should be in this quarter followed by demonstrations of a different kind, tending to show that whatever may be the feelings of individuals, there is no general disposition, especially

among the active portion of the present generation, and the younger class who are to constitute the next, to violate the amnesty which was solemnly sworn to, over the open sepulchres of our great revolutionary fathers ; — no disposition to build up the brazen wall of mutual hatred, which at one time separated New-England from the rest of the confederacy.

Why, indeed, should there be any such disposition in the young and active men of the present generation? Why should any son of New-England desire to alienate the land of his birth and abode from all community of interest, — all sympathy of feeling with the other states? Policy, — patriotism, — every consideration of an elevated character forbids the thought. Even party and personal motives, — so far as they result from the present situation of the country, — combine with those of a higher character to suggest a different course.

The author of the Remarks commences with a handsome complimentary notice of the general character of this journal, which he qualifies by the observation, that equal commendation cannot be given to all the articles, and that in the one on the Parties, the Review has ‘ obviously separated from the course which it ought to pursue.’ He has ‘ no doubt that a large proportion of those who have read this article, condemn it.’ While we express our gratitude to this writer, for his favorable estimate of the value of our usual labors, and cheerfully assent to the justice of the remark, that all the articles we publish are not entitled to equal commendation, we must beg leave to differ from him, as to the assertion that a large proportion of those who have read the article in question condemn it. At the time of its appearance the article attracted more than ordinary attention, and was noticed at considerable length in various newspapers in the different parts of the Union. With the exception of some communications which appeared in a daily journal of this city, and of which the source was perhaps not very remote from that of the remarks under review, these notices were uniformly favorable ; many of them warmly and emphatically so. Some recommended a republication of the article in a pamphlet form. The last survivor of the illustrious band of revolutionary patriots and statesmen, — the venerable Madison, — gave his approbation to the views taken in it. Various other persons of high respectability and of different political opinions, honored us with letters expressing their concurrence. Within the limited sphere of our personal observation, we found the

impression made by it decidedly agreeable, and had the satisfaction of hearing, especially from the younger portion of the public, frequent congratulations on its publication. We mention these facts, not from any vanity of authorship in regard to the article. We are well aware, that the merit of it, whatever it may be, lies entirely in the correctness of the sentiments, and that in other and abler hands, they would have assumed a far more plausible and attractive shape. But we mention them as evidences of what we believe to be true, that the general strain of the argument accorded with the public feeling. Even our author, although we ventured to differ from him as to the character of Mr. Jefferson, has no right, we think, to feel any personal dissatisfaction with the tone of our remarks. We treated him with uniform courtesy, and while we pointed out what we considered defects in his book, we gave it all the commendation to which it is fairly entitled, as an entertaining, and in some parts curious and valuable commentary on public events and characters.

The view taken of the character of Mr. Jefferson in the Familiar Letters, though no doubt very honestly entertained by the author, is the one which a warm partisan, as such, always takes of his opponent, whatever may be the subject in controversy. In the remarks made upon it in our preceding article, we merely applied to the case in question, the general principles which the philosophic historian habitually applies to all cases of a similar description, and by which the citizen of plain good sense and correct feeling governs himself in the ordinary intercourse of life. We succinctly recapitulated the origin and character of the great division of opinion, which has agitated the Christian world for three centuries, and which came to a crisis at the close of the last. We described the various communities of Europe and America, as all broken up into two internal parties, arrayed respectively under the banners of Liberty and Law. We stated that in this country, Mr. Jefferson was considered by the people as the leading representative and champion of the former party, as Fox was at the same time in England, and La Fayette in France. We said that these parties were composed like others of mixed materials : — that of the members of both, some acted on pure principles and patriotic feelings, and some from interested motives, while the mass were influenced by accidental circumstances over which they had little control.' In conclusion we

expressed the opinion that ‘taking the parties throughout, the proportion of the different sorts of ingredients was nearly the same in both, although each, in the section where it greatly predominated, naturally included a larger share of the intelligence, property, and influence of the community.’

In all this there was no pretension to novelty, nor did we consider ourselves as advancing any statement of fact or opinion in the least degree doubtful. Plain and obvious as our remarks were, they nevertheless appeared to us decisive of the question at issue. There may have been and doubtless were, in both these parties, as they existed in this and in every other country, good and bad men. If it can be shown that Mr. Jefferson, or any other person engaged in these controversies, attached himself to the party with which he acted from corrupt motives, or supported it by corrupt means, he must be regarded as belonging to the latter class: but this is not the form in which the question is presented. To the author of the *Familiar Letters*, Mr. Jefferson is obnoxious simply as a political character. It is not from any direct evidence or argument bearing on his personal qualities and conduct, but because he professed certain political opinions, and adopted or supported certain political measures, that his motives are questioned. But opinions and measures, the same in substance which rendered him obnoxious to his opponents, were at the same time professed and supported by a vast majority of the people in this, and other countries, including a fair proportion of the highest, best, and wisest men. If it was a crime in Mr. Jefferson to espouse the liberal in opposition to the conservative party, it was also a crime in La Fayette and Madame de Stael,—in Fox and Mackintosh,—in Franklin and Madison,—in the Emperor Alexander. The argument, in short, by proving, if it prove anything, a great deal too much, proves nothing at all. The political course of Mr. Jefferson, instead of showing that he was governed by questionable motives, exhibits him simply as one of the leading actors in the great movement of the time, wherein our country has taken so conspicuous a part, and which, in its principal particulars, has received throughout the strong approbation and enthusiastic sympathy of the American people. That Mr. Jefferson’s political course was of this description, does not necessarily prove that he was personally an upright and honest man; but if the contrary be asserted, it must be shown by sufficient evidence. No attempt of this

kind is made by the author of the Familiar Letters. He rests his case on political grounds alone ; his argument therefore fails entirely.

While by these obvious, and at the same time, as we consider them, decisive considerations, we endeavored to rescue the reputation of one of our most distinguished revolutionary patriots from unmerited obloquy, we were careful not to run into an error similar to the one which we were exposing in regard to his political opponents. Had we been writing under the influence of party-spirit, as it prevailed at the time among the opponents of Hamilton, we should have described him as a reckless and ambitious military chieftain, bent on the attainment of power by whatever means. Such was the light in which he appeared to the mere partisans in the ranks of his opponents. Instead of representing him under this point of view, we held up him and his friends, as adherents and partisans of the other leading principle of Law, — as members of the great legitimate or conservative party of Christendom, — individually as honest, as able, as zealous as their opponents. Our author does us injustice, therefore, when he says that our article was an ‘ apology and vindication of one of the old parties and a condemnation of the other, with an affectation of candor and impartiality which will deceive no one.’ The appearance of impartiality in the article will in fact deceive no one, because it corresponds with the substance. The view taken of the question was not affectedly or apparently, but really impartial, and has been so considered and spoken of in the various notices of it, that have appeared throughout the country. We challenge the author of the Remarks to point out a passage, or a word, in which we speak disparagingly of the party to which he belonged. We stated expressly, near the close of the article, as a summary of its contents, that the ‘ controversies of the last generation were such as might fairly and naturally exist among honest, intelligent and high-minded men ;’ — we recognised as belonging to that class ‘ the prominent individuals of the two principal shades of opinion, the Jeffersons, Madisons, Pinkneys, Clays and Wirts, on the one hand, and the Hamiltons, Parsonses, Ames, Cabots and Otises on the other.’ We described the case as ‘ one of those which so often occur when the best and wisest men in the community, among whom,’ as we remarked, ‘ the persons just mentioned must undoubtedly be ranked, happen from varieties of temperament or accidental

position, to take opposite views of the great political questions, which engage for the time the public attention.' We extended to the author of the Letters the benefit of the same charitable construction, which we had given to the conduct of the two parties, and although we regarded his book, in its bearing on Mr. Jefferson, as an ill-timed, and injudicious effort to depreciate the character of a distinguished public benefactor, we attributed and still attribute the writing of it to no worse motive than party-spirit. All this does not satisfy him. To award an equal proportion of talent and honesty to the two parties is not impartiality: it is a mere deceptive affectation of it. A real impartiality would consist in assigning to him and his political friends of the past generation, all the honesty, all the learning, and 'all the talents.' The French lady, who described herself as always in the right, — *il n'y a que moi qui ai toujours raison*, — thought herself, no doubt, the most impartial person in the world.

The considerations, by which we endeavored in our preceding article to rescue the reputation of Mr. Jefferson from the charges which the author of the Familiar Letters has lately revived, were, as we have said before, at once obvious and decisive. The author of the Remarks seems rather at a loss how to deal with them. His first feeling is to dispute the whole ground: — he is half-inclined to deny that there is any such division of opinion throughout Christendom, as we have described; — that the troubles of the present time have any connexion with the events that preceded them; — that *legitimacy* has anything to do with *law*. After pursuing for some time this line of argument, he is led by the force of truth into an admission of our principle in nearly the same words in which we had expressed it, thus giving up the question at issue, and leaving the character of Mr. Jefferson upon the impregnable ground on which our argument, placed it. Having done this, he proceeds, in the next page, apparently without any consciousness of the effect of his admissions, to renew the attack in detail, and through the rest of the pamphlet enlarges on various points in the character and measures of that statesman, which he deems objectionable. In replying to his Remarks upon our preceding article, we shall first notice some of the points in which he has misapprehended what we said before, and shall then advert particularly to the new attack which he has made, on the present occasion, upon the reputation of the author of the Declaration of Independence.

The first movement of the author of the Remarks seems to have been, as we have said, to dispute the whole ground we had taken, to deny the reality of any such struggle between the friends of reform, and of existing institutions, or, in other words, of Liberty and Law, as we had described, and to contest the correctness of our historical deduction of its origin. His observations to this effect are not fitted to give a very exact idea of what we had said on the subject, and require some correction even on the score of historical accuracy.

We had summarily stated, for example, ‘that the symptoms of the approach of the struggle just alluded to, might be seen in the Jack Cade rebellion in England, and that of the *Jacquerie* in France; in the tumultuous wars of the Flemish cities against their feudal lords, of the Guelphs and Ghibelins in Italy, and of the Comuneros in Spain.’ In these commonplace phrases our author sees occasion for much doubt and comment. ‘It is amusing,’ he says, ‘to find a writer of the present day referring to these facts, as proofs of progress in the science of government.’ One would suppose from this remark that we had referred to the events in question as proofs of progress in science of government. Our readers will have seen from the passage just quoted, the only one in which we mention them, that this is not the case. We described them as ‘symptoms of the approach of the struggle between the friends of reform and of existing institutions.’ The peasantry were then throughout all Europe in personal bondage, as they are now in Russia, and many parts of Austria and Prussia. The brazen collar was riveted round their necks; the iron of slavery had entered into their souls; they were brutes in the shape of men. The Jack Cade rebellion and the *Jacquerie* were among the convulsive efforts in which, under the sting of some more than ordinary outrage, they rose upon their masters. They were of the nature of the servile wars in Rome, and of the late Southampton tragedy in Virginia. They were proofs not of progress in the science of government, but of the existence of oppression in its worst and most revolting form. But they were also *symptoms* of the approach of better things: they showed that man, even in his lowest state of degradation, still retains some traces of his nobler nature; they showed that the intolerable yoke of feudal oppression could not and would not be endured forever; that it must in the end be shaken off; as it was.

When M. de Voltaire wishes to refute a particular book, says Montesquieu, he writes another book and then refutes the book which he has himself written. This was natural enough in the Philosopher of Ferney, who thought more of effect than truth. But what, after all, does a writer gain by refuting himself instead of his opponent?

The comments of our author upon the wars of the Guelphs and Ghibelins in Italy, are curious.

‘Of the Guelphs and Ghibelins of Italy, we have learned nothing from history, but that two noble families of Rome or its neighborhood carried on a most bloody and ferocious war for about three centuries, on one side of which, about the middle of the 12th century, the Ghibelins had the support of the Emperor of Germany, and the Guelphs that of the Pope. These wars were carried on long after the original cause of the quarrel was forgotten, which, as we have somewhere read or heard, was the right of property in, or some damage done to a greyhound, but we will not be positive on this point of history.’

This, then, is all that our author has learned from history of the noble struggle for the emancipation of Italy from the yoke of the foreign barbarian, (as the dwellers north of the Alps are there proudly called,) which engrossed the attention and occupies the annals of Europe for three centuries. Lord Byron understood the matter differently when he gave us in the fourth Canto of *Childe Harold*, his splendid imitation of the celebrated Sonnet of Filicaja.

‘Italia! oh Italia! thou who hast
The fatal gift of beauty, which became
A funeral dower of present woes and past,
On thy sweet brow is sorrow ploughed by shame,
And annals graved in characters of flame.
Oh God! that thou wert in thy nakedness
Less lovely, or more powerful, and couldst claim
Thy right, and awe the robbers back who press
To shed thy blood and drink the tears of thy distress.

Then might'st thou more appal, or less desired,
Be homely and be peaceful, undeplored
For thy destructive charms; then still untired
Would not be seen the armed torrents poured
Down the deep Alps; nor would the hostile horde

Of many-nationed spoilers from the Po
 Quaff blood and water : nor the stranger's sword
 Be thy sad weapon of defence, and so
 Victor or vanquished thou the slave of friend or foe.'

Of these 'annals, graved in characters of flame;' — of these 'armed torrents pouring down the deep Alps;' — of these 'hostile hordes of many-nationed spoilers, quaffing blood and water from the Po;' — of the whole glorious and fearful tragedy that crowds the volumes of Guicciardini, Machiavelli and Sismondi; — of the grand array of characters that still breathe and burn in the sombre portrait-gallery of Dante; — of all this the author of the Remarks, has, it seems, learned nothing from history. The affair, as he has read or heard, resolves itself into a dispute between two noble families in Rome about a greyhound.

It was a remark of Dr. Johnson upon the controversy between Milton and Salmasius, that when political subjects fall into the hands of grammarians, the rights of nations degenerate into questions of syntax. If we were to judge from his observations upon this subject of the nature of our author's studies, we should be tempted to conclude that the *Sporting Magazine* was a greater favorite with him than the *Historical Class Book*.

'As to the *Comuneros* of Spain, we confess our ignorance; we never heard of them before.'!!!

It was thought by Cicero somewhat discreditable to a Roman lawyer of eminence, that he was not thoroughly conversant in his own professional science. *Turpe est patricio et nobili et causas oranti jus in quo versaretur ignorare*. Is it quite natural in our author to admit, and with apparent complacency, that he 'never heard' of one of the most important, and at the same time most familiar events in modern history? Did he never read Robertson's Charles V.? The first thirty pages of the third book of that work are devoted to the war of the *Commoners*. That the author of the Remarks is in fact, as he says, entirely unacquainted with even the very slight and summary sketch there given of the events in question, however singular it may be, is yet so far honorable to him as it serves to account in some degree for the manner in which he speaks of them.

'As to the *Comuneros* of Spain we confess our ignorance: we never heard of them before. But we will venture to guess

that it was some sort of *Jacquerie* or Jack Cade insurrection, from the little we do know of Spanish history, of the age supposed to be alluded to.'

If we could suppose our author to have known much at the time of the events of which he was speaking, he could hardly be acquitted of offences, less venial than the mere want of historical learning. The war of the Commoners of Spain, as every reader moderately versed in history is of course aware, was one of the noblest struggles for constitutional liberty which have ever occurred in modern Europe. The failure of it was the real cause of the decline of Spain; as the success of the similar struggle that took place a century later in England, and ended in the establishment of the existing constitution in 1688, was the real cause of the subsequent greatness and glory of our parent-country. The names of the leader of the Commoners, Don Juan de Padilla, and his lady Donna Maria Pacheco, who also took a conspicuous part in the war, are among the most illustrious on record. Of the latter a distinguished Spanish writer remarks with the enthusiastic gallantry of his nation, that it would be necessary to invent a new language, in order to express half her merits. The Spanish Commoners had drawn up, with the intention of presenting it to their King Charles V. for his signature, a constitutional charter, the substance of which may be found in Robertson. It is in every way much superior to the far-famed English *Magna Charta*, which excites to so high a degree, and not without some reason, our author's enthusiasm. It provides among other things, that in all future meetings of the Cortes, each city shall send one representative of the clergy, one of the gentry, and one of the commons, each to be elected by his own order; that the crown shall not influence or direct any city, with regard to the choice of its representatives; that no member of the Cortes shall receive an office or pension, under pain of death, and confiscation of his goods; that each city or community shall pay a competent salary to its representatives, for their maintenance during their attendance on the Cortes; that the Cortes shall assemble once in three years at least, *whether summoned by the King or not*, and shall then inquire into the observation of the articles now agreed upon, and deliberate concerning public affairs; that judges shall have fixed salaries assigned them, and shall not receive any share of the fines and forfeitures of the persons condemned by them; that no grant of the goods of persons shall be valid, if given before sentence was pronounced against them; that all privi-

leges which the nobles have at any time obtained to the prejudice of the commons, shall be revoked ; that the government of cities and towns shall not be put into the hands of the nobles ; that the land of the nobles shall be subject to all public taxes in the same manner with those of the commons.

‘Such,’ says Robertson, after citing these and a number of other no less judicious and important provisions, ‘such were the chief articles presented by the Junta to their Sovereign. As the feudal institutions in the several kingdoms of Europe were originally the same, the genius of those governments which arose from them bore a strong resemblance to each other, and the regulations which the Castilians attempted to establish on this occasion, differ little from those which other nations labored to preserve in their subjects. The grievances complained of and the remedies proposed by the English Commons, in their contest with the princes of the House of Stuart, particularly resemble those upon which the Junta now insisted. But the Spaniards had already acquired ideas of their own liberty and independence, had formed bold and generous sentiments concerning government, and discovered an extent of political knowledge, to which the English did not attain till more than a century afterwards.’

We cannot, of course, go into this subject. The policy and foreign troops of Charles prevailed over the noble, but in some degree, undisciplined enthusiasm of the Commoners. Padilla fell a victim to the cause ; his letters to his wife and to his native city of Toledo, written on the day of his death, and which are given in Robertson, breathe a truly heroic spirit in strains of manly and touching eloquence. The latter seems to have suggested to the poet Moore the idea of his beautiful song, supposed to be addressed by a martyr in the cause of Irish liberty to his country.* When the generous soul of Padilla

* The letter of Padilla to his wife is as follows : — ‘Señora : — If your grief did not afflict me more than my own death, I should deem myself perfectly happy. For the end of life being certain to all men, the Almighty confers a mark of distinguishing favor upon that person for whom he appoints a death such as mine, which, though lamented by many, is nevertheless acceptable unto him. It would require more time than I now have, to write anything that could afford you consolation. That my enemies will not grant me, nor do I wish to delay the reception of that crown which I hope to enjoy. You may bewail your loss, but not my death, which, being so honorable, ought not to be lamented by any. My soul, for nothing else is left me, I bequeath to you. You will receive it as the thing in this world which you valued most. I do not write to my father, Pero Lopez, because I dare not,

took flight to a better world, the good genius of the Spanish Peninsula abandoned his charge. Under the unlimited despotism that prevailed ever afterwards, the country lost in rapid succes-

for though I have shown myself to be his son, in daring to lose my life, I have not been the heir of his good fortune. I will not attempt to say anything more, that I may not tire the executioner who waits for me, and that I may not excite a suspicion, that in order to prolong my life, I lengthened out my letter. My servant Sossa, an eye-witness, and to whom I have communicated my most secret thoughts, will inform you of what I cannot now write; and thus I rest, expecting the instrument of your grief and of my deliverance.'

The following is the letter to the city of Toledo. 'To thee, the crown of Spain and light of the world, — free from the time of the mighty Goths, — to thee, who by shedding the blood of strangers as well as thy own blood, hast recovered liberty for thyself and thy neighboring cities, thy legitimate son, Juan de Padilla, gives information how, by the blood of his body, thy ancient victories are to be refreshed. If fate hath not permitted my actions to be placed among your successful and celebrated exploits, the fault hath been in my ill fortune, not in my good will. This I request of thee as of a mother to accept, since God hath given me nothing more to lose for thy sake, than that which I am now to relinquish. I am more solicitous about thy good opinion than about my own life. The shiftings of fortune which never stand still are many. *But this I see with infinite consolation, that I, the least of thy children, suffer death for thee:* and that thou hast nursed at thy breast such as may take vengeance for my wrongs. Many tongues will relate the manner of my death, of which I am still ignorant, though I know it to be near. My end will testify what was my desire. My soul I commend to thee as to the patroness of Christianity. Of my body I say nothing, for it is not mine. I can write nothing more, for at this very moment I feel the knife at my throat with greater dread of thy displeasure, than apprehension of my own pains.'

At the time when this letter was written, Toledo was in possession of the Commoners under the command of the wife of Padilla, who held it for several months after her husband's death. When she found further resistance hopeless she escaped in disguise into Portugal, which was the seat of her family. The poem of Moore alluded to in the text is as follows; the close is evidently taken from the passage printed in italics, which probably suggested the whole.

'When he who adores thee, has left but the name
Of his faults and his sorrows behind,
Oh! say, wilt thou weep, as they darken the fame
Of a life that for thee was resigned?
Yes, weep, and however my foes may condemn,
Thy tears shall efface their decree;
For heaven can witness, though guilty to them,
I have been but too faithful to thee.

With thee were the dreams of my earliest love, —
Every thought of my reason was thine;
In my last humble prayer to the Spirit above
Thy name shall be mingled with mine.
Oh! blest are the lovers and friends who shall live
The days of thy glory to see;
*But the next dearest blessing that heaven can give,
Is the pride of thus dying for thee.'*

sion her political and military power, her literary glory, her population, her wealth, and finally her colonies, until she had gradually sunk into the state of hopeless and helpless imbecility in which we have lately seen her, and from which she is now attempting to recover. The reader will find in Robertson, or any other good history of Spain, the details of this eventful, spirit-stirring, and in the close mournful story. The whole affair is, it seems, entirely unknown to our author; and it is well, as we have said, for his reputation, that it is so. The terms in which he has spoken of these generous, and at the same time most judicious efforts in the cause of constitutional liberty, these splendid examples of individual heroism, would otherwise do but little honor to his own heart.

After the remarks to which we have now alluded upon the Jack Cade rebellion, the Guelphs and the Ghibelins, and the Spanish Comuneros, our author takes up the subject more at large, and gives us in ten pages a summary of universal history, 'from the earliest period' to the fall of Napoleon. The object seems to be to contest the correctness of our statement, in regard to the connexion between the great political divisions of the present age, and the events of the three preceding centuries. We had remarked in a few brief sentences, that the reformation, the British revolution of the seventeenth century, and our own revolution were so many successive developments in various forms, of substantially the same spirit, which produced the political agitations of the last half century in France, and throughout Europe. The bearing of this argument upon the view taken by our author, of the character of Mr. Jefferson, is apparent. The reformation, the British revolution, and our own, are all regarded with favor, by the great majority of the people of the United States. If the French revolution was only another development of the same principles; if it was, in fact, as it is generally considered, an immediate consequence and result of ours, it follows, of course, that it is not an unpardonable sin, in Mr. Jefferson, to have sympathized with the persons and parties, that were engaged in it, so far as they kept themselves within the limits of humanity and justice. In order to avoid this consequence, and to show that Mr. Jefferson must, necessarily, be a very suspicious character, because he looked with an eye of favor upon La Fayette and Madame de Stael, our author is compelled to, and actually does deny, that there was any

connexion between the French and American revolutions, or between our revolution and that of England in the seventeenth century, or between the latter and the Protestant reformation. The notion of the gradual elevation of the mass of the population throughout Europe, from the state of personal slavery to which they were reduced in the middle ages, to that of personal, political, and intellectual liberty, to which they are now tending, and have in part attained ; — this notion, we say, which is commonly received, as the most valuable and interesting result, to us at least, of our historical studies, is a mere chimera. No such progress has in fact taken place. The great events of the last three or four centuries, have no more connexion with each other, or with those of the present time, than with the Trojan war. Each is entirely distinct from the rest, and has a character of its own. The reformation, the British revolution, and ours, were just and beneficial movements, and the American people are right in approving them. The French revolution, on the contrary, was quite a different affair ; the American people, including Mr. Jefferson, made a great mistake in approving it, and our author 'is sorry to find that any well-informed American considers it as an occurrence which a free republican nation ought to regard with satisfaction, as a kindred case.'

It is the less necessary to attempt a serious reply to this course of argument, since our author himself is finally led by the force of truth, as we shall presently see, to acquiesce in the view which we have taken of the subject ; — to admit that there has been, for three or four centuries past, a steady and constantly progressive advance in political improvement, and that the efforts to promote this progress on the one hand, and to sustain established institutions against it on the other, are the real principles of the present political agitations. It may be sufficient, therefore, to observe here, in support of the view which we have taken, that it is one about which there is no dispute among tolerably intelligent men of whatever party. The strongest Conservatives and the warmest Whigs agree to it with equal readiness. Count de Maistre, Châteaubriand and Blackwood, concur with Constant, De Stael, and Mackintosh, in tracing the divisions of the present day, through their immediate antecedents in the American and British revolutions, up to their remote sources in the writings of Mon-

tesquieu and Locke, the preaching of Luther, and the increased wealth and intelligence of the body of the people.

Without attempting, therefore, to refute a train of argument, which our author himself is finally compelled to abandon, we shall merely glance at some of the singular paradoxes into which he has been led. Thus, we had remarked, that 'the British revolution was the first occasion on which the principle of reform, that had been so long at work, displayed itself in a great country in its proper shape, and that our own revolution was the next.' We regarded these as acknowledged facts. The author of the remarks is at some pains to make out the contrary. 'We think there is nothing new in the British revolution.' That is, we suppose, the constitution of human nature was the same in 1688, as it was at the time of the Trojan war, or as it is now. What then? Does our author suppose, that in representing the British revolution as the first in a particular sequence of events, we mean to affirm that the constitution of human nature was at that time regenerated? Because human nature is, and always will be, substantially what it always has been, does it follow that there can be no such thing as a sequence of events, succeeding and growing out of each other? Human nature was the same in the time of Cæsar, as in that of Scipio and Camillus. Does this prove, that the subjugation of Gaul and Britain were not events naturally growing in the order of cause and effect, out of the Punic wars, and the repulse of the Cimbri? Our author's assertion, admitting its truth, which nobody would of course think of contesting, has no bearing, whatever, upon the question.

Again; 'the British revolution,' says our author, 'was a mere confirmation of Magna Charta, though, on the whole, a much less important event, and, on the other hand, it has little or no resemblance to the American revolution.' Admitting this to be as true, as it evidently is incorrect, what would it prove? Is it supposed in the view we take of the subject, that the successive developments of the same great principles, — the successive steps in the same sequences of events, — must necessarily resemble each other in form? We have ourselves described the Reformation, and the tumultuous insurrections of the middle ages, as among the developments of the same principles, which afterwards produced the British and American revolutions. It is well known that the same principles may, and often do exhibit themselves under the most various and even opposite shapes. In order to place an event in a particu-

lar sequence, it is only necessary that it should belong there in the order of time, and of cause and effect. In its form it may, or may not, resemble the others of the same series.

Our author's assertion that the British revolution resembled the granting of *Magna Charta*, much more than it did the American revolution, would therefore, if true, be of no importance. The assertion itself, and especially the remark that the granting of *Magna Charta* was by much the more important measure of the two have, we think, but little plausibility. They are, in fact, among the most curious paradoxes which we recollect to have recently met with. Our author seems to have mistaken the purport of the observations of Sir James Mackintosh upon *Magna Charta*. Sir James speaks of it as a record of principles. Considered under this point of view, it deserves all the commendation he bestows upon it. As a political measure, the granting of it was of little or no importance. It hardly exercised a momentary influence upon the state of the country. It left things exactly where it found them; and so far was it from furnishing any real assurance of better political institutions, that the troubles out of which it grew, were followed by the almost unlimited despotism of the Tudors and the Stuarts. It was not till the effort to obtain religious freedom had directed the attention of the whole people to their personal rights, that the movement began, which ended in the secure establishment of those rights at the revolution of 1688. The Puritans commenced this movement, and it is therefore to them, as Hume himself, — no friend of Puritanism, or of liberty, — very correctly remarks, that England is indebted for all her political liberty. Even as a record of principles, *Magna Charta*, however valuable considering its date, — and we are in no way disposed to underrate it, — bears no comparison with the great acts of 1688, or with the Charter of the Spanish Commoners, which our author never heard of. It was the act of the feudal aristocracy, and was intended as a proclamation of their rights, as against their feudal sovereign. It not only made no provision for the rights of the people, but it expressly recognised the mass of them as *villains*. It secured the *slave* in the possession of his *wagon*, the instrument with which he did the work of his master, and this our author very seriously cites as a proof that there is not one principle of English *liberty*, as established at the revolution, which is not expressed or implied in the Charter. But were it even as a declaration of

rights more complete than it is, the case would still be the same as to its importance, in comparison with the revolution of 1688. The great object with the people, is not to *declare* their rights, but to *secure* them. A declaration of rights, or any other written constitution or charter, is an article of easy manufacture. A sheepskin, or a few linen rags, with a drop of ink, a goose quill, half an hour's time, and a little common-place learning, will accomplish the purpose. To *secure* the rights so declared is another affair. Centuries of toil and effort, — rivers of blood and tears, — the heroic self-sacrifice of whole generations, — the loftiest talents, the noblest virtues, and in concurrence with these, the happiest fortune, have hitherto been found necessary for effecting this object. *Magna Charta* declared the rights of the barons, but left even them in practice exactly where it found them. The revolution *secured* the rights of the *people*. This is the precise difference between the operation of these two events, and if our author consider the former as the more important, we can only say that the result of his historical researches is very different from that of ours.

In farther illustration of his assertion, that the great events which preceded and prepared the French revolution were entirely disconnected with that and each other, our author is at some pains to show that the results of the British revolution of 1688, and of the American revolution, were entirely unlike. The substance of what he says is, that the former established a monarchical government, and the latter a republican one. This is little better than mere sophistry. The revolution of 1688, so far as it interfered with the monarchical department of the government, did not establish, but on the contrary subverted it. Its operation on the prerogative was to limit its extent, and it did this so effectually, that since that time the king has never ventured to negative a bill or to sustain a minister against a majority of the House of Commons. The difference between the results of the British and American revolutions was, that the latter did the same work thoroughly, which the former commenced and left half-done. According to the figurative language of Horne Tooke, the former stopped at Brentford, while the latter went all the way to Windsor. Were the view taken by our author a just one, our position would not be the less sound. We have not affirmed, that the events which prepared the French revolution were alike in form, but that they were successive developments of

the same great principles. That this was true of the British and American revolutions is so far from being doubtful, that in these cases the same principles were also professed and brought into action by the same men, that is, by the same class of men, we mean the Puritans. As the parent country is indebted, by the acknowledgment of Hume, for all its liberty to the Puritans who remained at home, — so we are indebted to those who emigrated for the establishment of our independence. The spirit that revolted at the pretensions of the British hierarchy, was the same which a century later spurned at the stamp-act and the tea-tax. This is all that we have said; whether the results of victory in the two struggles were precisely the same, is not to the point. It does however so happen in this instance, that the British and American revolutions bear in form precisely that relation to each other, which might be expected from successive developments of the same great principles, under the different circumstances of the two cases. A second effort, made with the consciousness of power acquired by a preceding triumph, and under other circumstances more favorable to free and untrammelled action, might naturally be expected, if successful, to produce results more complete, decisive, and thorough, though in a similar way. This is precisely what happened. The friends of liberty in England, hampered by existing institutions, and as yet hardly conscious themselves of what they wanted, were contented with half-way measures. Our fathers, enlightened and strengthened by the experience of two centuries of virtual independence and liberty, knew what they were really aiming at, and marched up boldly and resolutely to the mark. The former reduced the king to a mere machine; the latter removed him from the chess-board. That these were natural forms for the successive developments of the same principles under the different circumstances of the two cases, is quite too clear to require further argument.

When Homer in the *Iliad* intends to convey a grand idea of the movement of the Ruler of the ocean, he represents him as taking only four steps in his progress from the top of Olympus to his head-quarters. ‘Three steps he took in his progress, and at the fourth he reached his journey’s end.’

Τρις μὲν ὄρεξαι ἰών τὸ δὲ τέτατον ἔκετο τεκμήρ.

The genius of Reform (if we may be allowed, without offence to our author, who does not much relish personifications, although he has no distaste for personalities, to personify the

principles which for two or three centuries have been agitating the Christian world) the genius of Reform, in like manner, in his progress over Europe and America, took three giant steps before he fixed his foot at the fourth upon the firm foundation whence he was to shake the world. These three steps were the Reformation and the British and American revolutions. The French revolution was the fourth and last.

In this portion of his Remarks, it is the principal object of our author to decry the French revolution with the view of throwing odium on Mr. Jefferson, as one of its supposed admirers, and on us as his advocates. Our author can see nothing in the French revolution but its worst excesses. These are exhibited in beautiful array, as they are set forth in order in the chronological tables. The pleasing reminiscences of Robespierre, Marat and the rest of that amiable fraternity, are once more presented to us, and we are invited to see the public executioner fighting over again his battles with youth, beauty and innocence in the name of liberty. These horrors, we are told, are unlike any that were ever witnessed at any other time. 'They have no parallel in the history of the world.' But our author charitably supposes that they were regarded by Mr. Jefferson, and are now by ourselves, with unaffected satisfaction, as the last results of human perfectibility. The catalogue of odious and disgusting atrocities to which we have alluded, is given as 'a condensed view of the progress of the French revolution, which was so much an object of Mr. Jefferson's delight, and is, if we mistake not, complacently regarded by the Reviewer.' 'If the Reviewer sees in the French revolution wherewith to be proud of, and to foster his love of the human race, we cannot see with his eyes.' In the view of our author, the scene of the French revolution was the Place de Grève, — the guillotine its principal means of operation, and the executioner its hero. — Every one who sees anything to approve in it must of course have fallen in love with these delightful objects.

All this is at once incorrect and disingenuous. It is not true, in the first place, that the excesses of the French revolution have no parallel in the history of the world. They differ in no material respect from the similar excesses, that have at so many other periods disgraced the annals of Christendom. One of the most revolting of the revolutionary horrors, — we mean the opening of the royal sepulchres at St. Denis, — has been paralleled this very year, in our own neighborhood.

The victims of the reign of terror, though it lasted three or four years, are supposed to have been less numerous than those of the St. Bartholomew's day.

Again; the attempt to fasten on Mr. Jefferson, and the other friends of liberty, the responsibility for the excesses of the French revolution, is disingenuous. These excesses are not the revolution; they had no necessary connection with it. The revolution was a vast political movement, embracing most of the important transactions of the last fifty years, throughout Christendom. Its objects were the reform of abuses and the introduction of improved political institutions, in one word *Liberty*. These objects have been to a great extent effected in some of the most important countries of Europe and the world. Representative government, religious toleration, the liberty of the press, additional securities for personal rights have been established as results or under the influence of the French revolution, through the whole southern and western sections of Europe, in Spanish and Portuguese America, and even in Greece. The American people have always approved of these results, and sympathized in the movement that has produced them; Mr. Jefferson shared this feeling; we are free to confess that we share it ourselves. If it be treason to rejoice at the progress of representative government, religious freedom, and general education, and civilization, we must plead guilty, and as Patrick Henry said on another occasion, 'let them make the most of it.' This however is the French revolution, and for ourselves we 'see much in it (to use our author's rather homely language) *wherewith to be proud of* and to foster our love of the human race.'

The excesses of the French revolution are quite another affair. Nobody approves them; nobody ever dreamed of speaking of them in any other terms than those of horror and disgust; Mr. Jefferson detested them as much as our author. In our preceding article, we spoke of them as 'unpardonable excesses which none could lament and abhor more sincerely than ourselves.' Is it fair? Is it ingenuous? Is it just to endeavor to fasten upon Mr. Jefferson, or upon us, the responsibility for these excesses, because we approve the objects and the results of the French revolution, so far as it was kept within the limits of humanity and justice? Does it in good earnest necessarily follow that representative government is a bad thing, because Robespierre, and Fouquier Tinville were bad men? Is the general diffu-

sion of knowledge to be deprecated, because a horde of ignorant ruffians who were what they were chiefly from the want of this general diffusion of knowledge, perpetrated, when in power, the outrages which ignorant ruffians in power may be expected to perpetrate? Do the Inquisition, or the St. Bartholomew's Day, prove anything against the truth or value of religion? Common sense revolts at this line of argument, which our author is now, after a silence of twenty years, reviving against Mr. Jefferson. It has always been the policy of the aristocratic party in Europe, to endeavor to confound the objects and the results of the French revolution with its excesses, in order to throw upon the former the odium that belongs to the latter only. In pursuing the same line of argument our author shows, that his sympathies are, as we remarked in our preceding article, with the European aristocracy. In reality, the intelligent friends of liberty, far from looking with any favor or tenderness upon the excesses of the French revolution, have always regarded them with particular disapprobation, and for the very obvious reason that they were not only outrages upon humanity and justice, but a disgrace to the cause of liberty, and an obstacle to its progress. For the same reason the enemies of liberty have always secretly rejoiced at their occurrence, and have at times done what they could to promote it.

In the same spirit our author endeavors to fasten upon Mr. Jefferson, and on us as his advocates, the responsibility for the errors and faults of Napoleon, because we said in our preceding article, that his reign was one of the phases of the French revolution, and that the general results of the revolution are in the main good. He wonders how we can possibly discern in his dominion anything favorable to liberty, or the natural rights of man, and then politely inquires, whether we will 'please to point out a case in the whole range of history, in which any man who rose to be the "people personified" proved to be a more unfeeling and selfish tyrant.' It does not for a moment enter his imagination, that a useful object may be brought about by very objectionable agents: — that Providence often educes good out of partial evil: — that popular institutions may have been, and no doubt have been transported on the point of the bayonet of Napoleon, into regions where they would not, for a long time to come, have penetrated in any other way. He cannot conceive, that, — independently of this consideration, — a vast political movement, comprehending

a great variety of particular actions, may produce on the whole beneficial results, even though some one or more of these particular actions, and the actors engaged in them, may work out directly nothing but unmixed evil.

As to the character of Napoleon, since our author is pleased to request our opinion, we shall give it to him with perfect frankness. On that point we have no disguise. We have more than once had occasion to speak of the 'Man of Destiny,' and have always done it in the same terms. We consider him as an apostate from the cause of liberty. He had before him, at the critical point in his career, the three paths that had been trodden successively by Cromwell, Monk and Washington ; he might have taken either with entire safety and success. The friends of liberty and his own true friends hoped that he would choose the last ; the aristocracy recommended the second ; he rejected both and fixed upon the first. This was his crime, and what Talleyrand would have thought a much worse thing, his fault. He displayed the highest intellectual capacity, but he failed for want of the elevated moral qualities which the emergency required. We do not, however, consider him as 'the most unfeeling and selfish tyrant that ever rose to power ;' and since our author so politely requests it, we will mention two or three who appear to us more so. Nero, who fiddled while Rome was burning ; — Caligula, who wished that the whole Roman people had but one neck that he might cut it off at a blow ; — Henry VIII. of England, who beheaded his wife to make room for another, as often as he saw a new face that struck his fancy ; — and Charles X. of France, who employed himself coolly in hunting at Versailles, during the three days when his subjects were slaughtering each other in the streets of Paris, and when three words from him would have set all right ; — these were all more unfeeling and selfish tyrants than Napoleon. It is easy to kick the dead lion. When Hector was alive, the sound of his chariot wheels would set the whole Grecian army in a panic, but after his corpse had been brought to the camp, it was a mere pastime to thrust a dagger into it. 'There stood not an Argive near the chief,' says Homer, 'who inflicted not a wound.' Generous souls ! — But such is poor human nature.

Napoleon had his faults and they were great and glaring enough to satisfy any tolerably reasonable enemy, but he was not the ruffian that our author seems to be disposed to make him out. There was on the contrary a seductive softness,

— a kind of fascination in his manner, which neither man nor woman could resist. He combined to an astonishing, an almost unexampled extent, the loftiest capacity for the highest spheres of action, with a strong passion and aptitude for the arts and graces of polished life. He failed in exercising a moral control over the wild aspirations of his boundless ambition, but who shall say how far an apology may be found for his defects in this respect, in the circumstances of his education and the force of his genius, which exposed him to seductions that common men are never called on to resist? Such as he was, he stands forth emphatically, and *par excellence*, the great man of modern history.

‘Never,’ says La Martine, in his powerful ode to Bonaparte, — no political partisan either, nor yet a friend of liberty, but a royalist of the sturdiest stamp, — ‘never, since the two great names that have been handed down so long from one generation to another, has any name been noised so widely abroad; no mortal foot ever stamped upon the earth a deeper track. Ah fortunate soldier!’ he continues, ‘hadst thou but restored the sceptre when it came within thy grasp to its rightful possessor, and reinstated at the same time Religion in her pristine splendor, — as the champion of kings, how much greater hadst thou been than kings themselves! With what a crown of radiant glory would not history then have encircled thy forehead! But it might not be. Glory, — honor, — freedom, — the words that we all worship were for thee unmeaning sounds; they fell unnoticed, — unheard, — on an ear that could listen to nothing but the trumpet’s call and the clashing music of the sabre.’ There are few things in modern poetry finer than the closing stanzas of this poem, and we quote them with pleasure as a proper qualification of our author’s stern and contemptuous condemnation of the fallen hero.

‘On dit qu’aux derniers jours de sa longue agonie,
Devant l’éternité seul avec son génie,
Son regard vers le ciel, parut se soulever;
Le signe rédempteur toucha son front farouche; . . .
Et même on entendit commencer sur sa bouche
Un nom . . . qu’il n’osait achever.

Achève! . . . c'est le Dieu qui règne et qui couronne ;
 C'est le Dieu qui punit ; c'est le Dieu qui pardonne ;
 Pour les héros et nous, il a des poids divers.
 Parle lui sans effroi ! lui seul peut te comprendre !
 L'esclave et le tyran ont tous un compte à rendre,
 L'un, du sceptre, l'autre des fers.

Son cerceuil est fermé ; Dieu l'a jugé ; silence !
 Son crime et ses exploits pèsent dans la balance :
 Que des faibles mortels, la main n'y touche plus.
 Qui peut sonder, Seigneur, ta clémence infinie ?
 Et vous, fléau de Dieu ! qui sait si le génie
 N'est pas une de vos vertus ?

'Tis said that on one of the last days of his long agony, when he found himself with all his genius alone on the threshold of eternity, his hand formed upon his stern forehead the sign of redemption, and that he was heard half-pronouncing a name which he ventured not to finish.

'Say on ; — 'tis the God who dispenses kingdoms ; the God who punishes ; the God who pardons : — Has he not a different scale for heroes and for common men ? Speak to him without fear ! He alone can comprehend you. The slave and the tyrant must each render his account, — the one of his sceptre, the other of his chains.

'The sepulchre is closed ; — the last judgment is pronounced ; the exploits and the crimes of the mighty dead have been weighed in the balance of a higher than any human tribunal. Let not feeble man undertake to scrutinize the sentence. Who, Almighty One ! shall sound the depths of thy mercy ? And you, Scourge of God ! who shall say that your genius will not find acceptance as a virtue ?'

But we have pursued this majestic phantom of the fallen hero a little too far, and must hurry again into the track. Whatever may have been the errors or the crimes of Napoleon, the friends of liberty are not more responsible for them than they are for the rest of the excesses and misfortunes that attended the French revolution, and defeated or retarded its natural results. To pretend to visit these enormities upon the sage of Monticello is about as reasonable as it would be to consider Fenelon responsible for the acts of the Holy Inquisition.

In connexion with his effort to throw odium on the objects and general results of the French revolution, our author endeavors to show that it had little or no connexion with ours.

‘It is difficult to believe with the Reviewer that it began under American influence. The great body of the French nation knew but little of America and cared less.’

Very likely ; but did the great body of the French nation begin the revolution ? What is gained by arguing in the face of the most certain and notorious facts ? Is there any doubt that Lafayette was the hero of the earlier period of the French revolution, or that he was educated in the school of Washington ? Is there any doubt that the Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of 1790, were drawn up in concert by him and Mr. Jefferson ? ‘There were causes enough,’ says our author, ‘for a convulsion in France, accumulating through centuries, without supposing, as the Reviewer seems to do, that there would not have been a revolution there, if the American revolution had never been.’ This is a partial misrepresentation of our idea. We have not said ‘that there would not have been a revolution in France if the American revolution had never been.’ It is quite possible that there might have been in the course of all future time, not only one, but many revolutions in France, if ours had not occurred. What we said was, that *the* revolution which did occur, took place to a great extent under *American* influence. We did not intimate that there were no causes for a revolution accumulated through centuries in France. We said on the contrary, that our example was ‘the spark that fired the mass of revolutionary materials, which had been so long accumulating in France ; — that the fourth of July, 1776, opened a new era in the history of the civilized world.’*

In saying this, we did but repeat a familiar and acknowledged truth, partly in the very words of a European writer of high distinction. Why should our author shrink from admitting it ? Why

* While this sheet is passing through the press, we find in the newspapers of the day, the following letter from Mr. George W. Lafayette to the President of the United States, which may serve as a confirmation, if any were necessary, of the statements given in the text.

PARIS, JUNE 15, 1834.

SIR, — A great misfortune has given me more than one solemn and important duty to fulfil, and the ardent desire of accomplishing with fidelity my father's last will, emboldens me to claim the patronage of the President of the United States, and his benevolent intervention, when I am obliged respectfully and mournfully to address the Senate and Representatives of a whole nation.

Our forever beloved parent possessed a Copperplate, on which was inscribed the first engraved copy of the American Declaration of Independence, and his last intention, in departing this world, was, that the precious plate

should he fear to assume for his country the glory of having immediately led the way in the great struggle for political, intellectual and moral improvement, which makes up the history of Christendom for the last half-century, because it has been here and there stained with some transient excesses? Is it not for us who live in the 'head-quarters of good principles,' a proud thought that the mighty spirit of reform, which is now striding like a giant through the Christian world, and shaking down established abuses at every step, was rocked as an infant in the old Cradle of Liberty? That the voices of our noble ancestors have been echoed from every region between the shores of the Pacific Ocean and those of the Mediterranean sea, till they have finally waked the departed spirits of the heroes of Marathon and Leuctra? Is there another city on the globe that has any title to glory which can fairly be brought into comparison with this? Is there any citizen of Boston recreant enough to abjure it for his native place, because the defence of liberty and good principles has been at times in other lands entrusted to false friends? Has not the same thing happened in all similar cases? Shall we deny the merit of Washington, or the advantages of our own revolution, because Benedict Arnold proved a traitor, and Paine a scoffer at religion?

Far from seeking to dispute the connexion between the French revolution, and our own, or wishing to shake off the responsibility resulting from it, we should rather assert and boast of it, as one of the proudest trophies of the country. The excesses that occasionally disgrace and check the cause of improvement, are transient; its results remain and will change the face of the world.

should be presented to the Congress of the United States, to be deposited in their Library, as a last tribute of respect, patriotic love and affection, for his adopted country.

Will it be permitted to me, *a faithful disciple of that American School* whose principles are so admirably exposed in that immortal declaration, to hope that you, sir, would do me the honor to communicate this letter to both Houses of Congress, at the same time that, in the name of his afflicted family, you would present to them my venerated father's gift.

In craving such an important favor, sir, the son of General Lafayette, the adopted grand-son of Washington, knows, and shall never forget, that he would become unworthy of it, if he were ever to cease to be a French and American patriot.

With the utmost respect, I am, sir,

Your devoted and obedient servant.

GEORGE W. LAFAYETTE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Yet freedom! yet thy banner, torn and flying,
Streams like a thunder-gust *against* the wind,
Thy trumpet-voice, though broken now, and dying,
The loudest still, the tempest leaves behind ;
Thy tree hath lost its blossoms, and the rind
Chopp'd by the axe, looks rough, and little worth,
But the sap lasts, — and still the seed we find,
Sown deep, even in the bosom of the North,
So shall a better spring, less bitter fruit bring forth.

After remarking in the manner which we have now described on our statements of historical facts, our author next takes exception to the view we have given of the leading principles and objects of the two great parties that divide the Christian world. We have represented these parties as arrayed respectively under the banners of Liberty and Law. We purposely adopted this form of expression as one, which, while it indicates correctly the true character of the two opinions, is at the same time courteous, respectful and just to the adherents of both. This does not satisfy our author, but in order to find any plausible objection to our idea, he is compelled to misrepresent it. He says, that we mean by *law*, the despotic system of the holy alliance.

‘On the continent of Europe the governments of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, are absolute monarchies, and the sovereigns assume to wear their crowns in their own right and independently of the people whom they govern. This claim to rule has, we believe, acquired the name of legitimacy in opposition to natural rights and law. These monarchs take upon themselves to punish with imprisonment or death, every one who dares to raise his voice or use his pen in denial of their supreme right. This sort of authority, the Reviewer is pleased to designate by the term law?’

What do we say ourselves? ‘Liberty and law, are essential elements in the constitution of society, *in whatever form it may be organized*, and neither can possibly exist in practice to the entire exclusion of the other.’

Is this saying that law means military despotism? Is not our author aware, that in all political societies, there must be from the necessity of the case, and without any reference to the particular form of the government, on the one hand a greater or less degree of power, exercised by the society through the government according to *law*, and on the other, a greater or less degree of *liberty*, belonging to the individual citizen?

Has it escaped his observation, that in all political societies, where the expression of opinion is admitted, there have always been two parties, one aiming in its general tendency, to increase and strengthen the influence of the government; the other to extend the sphere of individual action or liberty? Is it not apparent to every one that these two different, and sometimes opposite tendencies, form the basis of the great division of opinion throughout Christendom? This is what we have said. In saying it, we consider ourselves not as advancing new or questionable theories, but as simply repeating acknowledged truths. We meant not to say, nor have we said, that the partisans of law approve precisely *the* law, as it exists in any country, — least of all that of Turkey, or Russia; but that they desire *a* law of some sort which shall be adequate to the purpose of preserving social order, and securing the welfare of the community. The friends of liberty, on the other hand, are not understood to pledge themselves as such, to an approbation of the exact measure of liberty enjoyed in this, or that country, but to profess and practice on a general disposition to extend as far as possible, the sphere of individual action.

In all this, as there is nothing new or doubtful, so there is nothing disrespectful or injurious to either of the parties. Both may be, and doubtless in the main are equally sincere and well-meaning; as both may be, and no doubt sometimes are in error, in regard to the particular points of opinion or practice upon which they may differ. Nor is there any thing unusual in the use we have made in this connexion of the term law. If it were worth while to cite authorities in support of so clear a point, we might quote the celebrated passage from Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity; 'what then shall we say of law, but that her seat is the bosom of God, — her voice the harmony of the world?' We used the word in the same sense in which it is used in this passage. If our author do not understand it, it is not our fault; if understanding it, he will undertake to say, that it is a disparagement to any man, or party of men, to be called the adherents of law in this sense of the term, we can only say that he is a very unreasonable person. Burke, Hamilton, Ames, and the other great men of all countries, who have attached themselves to this party, would have considered our representation of their opinions and objects, as the highest compliment that we could have paid them. It is the one which they habitually give themselves.

The *spirit of the age* : — this again, is a phrase which our author is utterly unable to comprehend. ‘We think the phrase, spirit of the age, has no intelligible meaning.’ In our preceding article, we remarked, that ‘a zeal, — a rage we may call it, — for improvement, was the leading characteristic of the period, — or in the common language, — *the spirit of the age*.’ For ourselves, we must say that we are unable to see what there is in this, either obscure or objectionable. We think that the remark would be readily agreed to, by intelligent men of all parties. Every body, excepting our author, is aware that the source of the political agitations of the last half century, and to a considerable extent of the last three centuries, has been an effort to bring about improvement in political and social institutions. Those who favor this effort, consider it as judicious, and deserving of encouragement ; — those who oppose it, consider it as injudicious, and likely to end in mischief ; but all agree that ‘a zeal, — a rage for political improvement, is the characteristic of the times, — the spirit of the age.’ Our author says, that ‘because a majority of a whole nation believe that evil exists, which can be remedied, or good effected, it does not follow, that the fact is so, for a whole nation may be under a delusion.’ This is no doubt true, but what then ? The question is not whether ‘the zeal, — the rage for improvement,’ — to which we alluded, is right or wrong, — judicious or injudicious, — beneficial or injurious, — but whether it exists : whether the phrase, *spirit of the age*, has any intelligible meaning, — whether it indicates something real in the present state of the world, or is a mere sound, signifying nothing. For ourselves, when we contemplate the intense effort, — the struggle, — the agony that has existed throughout Christendom, for the last half century ; society arrayed into hostile armies, contending for life and death on the field, in deliberative assemblies, through the press ; — when we see the results of this contest in the countless revolutions, — the innumerable new constitutions, — the emancipated colonies, the prostrate dynasties ; — all the great and sudden catastrophes, that give such a fearful interest to the course of contemporary history ; — when we take into view in connexion with these events, the immense apparatus now in action for intellectual, moral and religious purposes, unknown, unheard of at any other period, — the associations for promoting education, diffusing knowledge, encouraging temperance, propagating religion, — the schools, the

colleges, the lyceums ; — the ceaseless activity of the press ; — when we look at all this, we cannot help thinking, that there is *something* at work which distinguishes the present period, from those which preceded it, and that this something is a zeal, — a rage, — judicious or not, — for improvement. If our author has yet seen nothing of all this, we advise him to open his eyes ; — if seeing and admitting the prevailing rage for improvement, and its results, he still deny that it can properly be called *the spirit of the age*, the question, is of course, a merely verbal one, which we need not take the trouble to argue.

After disputing in this way, — with what success our readers are able to judge, — the correctness of our statements of fact and principle, it is almost amusing to find our author compelled by the force of truth to acquiesce, as it were involuntarily, in the general view which we have given of the origin and character of the political divisions of the present time. His language even is not materially different from ours. We remarked that ‘ circumstances which did not require to be recapitulated, but which resolved themselves substantially into the *increased wealth and intelligence* of the industrious classes of the community, had inspired these classes in all the most civilized countries, but especially in France, with a strong desire to reform the existing constitutions of government, and to incorporate into them principles more favorable to individual rights and liberty.’ What says our author ? ‘ Within the last two centuries there has been a *diffusion of intelligence*, which has led many minds to contemplate a better state of things in freeing themselves from hereditary rights, brought on by the evils of former centuries. There is one party who incline to hold on to usages ; the other desire to abolish them. They occasionally fight, and relapse into the old state of things, perhaps with some change for the better, perhaps not.’

If all this be so ; — as we most powerfully and potently believe, — we would ask our author why he has given himself the trouble to write a pamphlet for the purpose of disputing a few statements of ours which tend to the very same conclusion ? If for the two last centuries there has been a continued ‘ effort of many minds to effect certain objects,’ why deny that the great events of those two centuries, which have resulted from this effort, had a connexion with each other, and proceeded from the same principles ? If the object of this effort be to

change existing institutions *for the better*, why deny that it is the effect of a zeal for improvement? Is not improvement a change for the better? If the 'many minds' who are engaged in this effort are endeavoring to *free* themselves from restraint, why deny that they are partisans of *liberty*? If the restraints from which they are endeavoring to free themselves are hereditary *rights* and usages, why deny that the persons who are inclined to hold on to these rights are partisans of *law*?

'Which of such (these) parties,' says our author at the close of the passage just quoted, 'is the Spirit of the Age?' We answer neither. The spirit of the age is not a party. But if one of these parties proceed upon opinions and feelings which have grown up within the 'two last centuries,' and the other 'holds on to rights and usages that have come down from former centuries,' is there anything unnatural or improper in saying that the spirit which actuates the latter, is the spirit of past ages, and that which actuates the other, the spirit of the present age, or, elliptically, the *Spirit of the Age*?

In this and some other passages of the same general purport, which we need not quote, our author, in the very act of controverting our positions, admits, and almost in the same language which we have used ourselves, all that is necessary to establish their correctness. In so doing, he concedes, as we stated at the outset, the whole ground immediately in dispute, and abandons entirely the only tenable basis upon which he can place his imputations on the character of Mr. Jefferson. The mind of that statesman was one of the 'many, which in consequence of the diffusion of knowledge have been led, within the last two centuries to contemplate a better state of things in freeing themselves from hereditary rights brought on by the events of former centuries.' Of these many minds, his was among the most powerful, and his efforts to effect the objects they all had in view, were among the most active, persevering and consistent that were made. He succeeded, in connexion with his brother patriots of the revolution, in freeing himself from the hereditary right to govern this country which was claimed for the British crown. At a later period he sympathised with the efforts which were made by 'many minds' in different parts of Europe, to free themselves from similar hereditary rights claimed for other crowned heads and privileged orders. This was his whole political ex-

istence and activity. It was for this that he was denounced in the first instance by the British government, and subsequently by the party in Europe, who were inclined to 'hold on to usages,' and those who sympathised with them, no doubt very honestly, in this country, as corrupt, ambitious, unprincipled and selfish; — as a visionary theorist, — a demagogue, — an atheist, — a philosopher, — as acting under French influence. That such charges should have been made by the violent members of an opposite party, in times of warm controversy is quite natural, and conformable to the ordinary course of things in similar cases. But it is not quite so natural that they should be revived twenty years after the controversy is over, and when nearly all the persons actively engaged in it are dead and buried, by a writer who admits at the same time that the great movement in which Mr. Jefferson took a part, and by the nature and objects of which his political character must be judged, was the commendable effort of 'many minds,' under the influence of an increasing diffusion of knowledge, to free themselves from the hereditary restraints, which had been imposed upon their ancestors in former centuries of ignorance and oppression. Mr. Jefferson, as we have said, was one of the most able, active, and prominent of these 'many minds.' For his great activity and zeal in the cause in which they were engaged, he was admired by one portion of his contemporaries and depreciated by another. If our author is willing to admit, as he finally does, that this cause was in the main a good one, he is bound in consistency to extend the same favorable conclusion to the character of Mr. Jefferson, and without relinquishing the right to object in detail to any of his measures or opinions that may appear questionable, to allow that his intentions were upright, and that the general scope of his policy was correct, laudable, and in conformity to the *Spirit of the Age*.

If our author were a close and correct reasoner, it would be a matter of curiosity to see how he would extricate himself from the dilemma in which he is placed by the inconsistency between the general train of his argument and the admissions to which we have alluded. But this is a difficulty which gives him no trouble and which he probably did not feel. He is quite as insensible to the effect of his own admissions as to that of the reasoning of his opponents. After conceding all that is wanted for the establishment of the purity and upright-

ness of Mr. Jefferson's character, he proceeds very coolly, and in the same breath, apparently without the slightest consciousness of inconsistency, to repeat the same denunciations of him which formed the staple of the Familiar Letters. He is again held up to the contempt and detestation of the American people, as ambitious, 'aiming at absolute dominion,' and at the same time 'mean, jealous, envious, and certainly *timid*.' A beautiful catalogue of epithets to grace the monument of the author of the Declaration of Independence! He is again represented with no attempt at proof and very little specification, as 'setting the example of abominable, desolating corruption;' 'inviting and rewarding apostacy;' — 'excluding, vilifying, and *expatriating* (this is an active verb in our author's vocabulary;) all the citizens except his own partisans,' — 'breaking down the co-ordinate branches of the government,' — 'harassing, distressing and annihilating commerce,' — 'protecting the movers of sedition,' — 'patronising French and alien clubs,' — as the slave of foreign influence, and, finally, as the father of Nullification. To all this the true answer is, as we have just remarked, that the view here given of his character and measures, was the one taken by the zealots of the party who were inclined 'to hold on to usages,' and considered the effort of 'many minds, to free themselves from the hereditary yoke which had been imposed upon them by their ancestors,' as anarchy, atheism and Jacobinism: that in doing justice to the cause in which Mr. Jefferson was engaged, our author has virtually done justice to him, and that he cannot consistently with himself, repeat the imputations which were circulated in his life-time by his political opponents, and were founded in the view they took of the general tendency of his opinions.

This, we say, is the true answer to our author's long indictment, and here perhaps we might fairly rest the argument. But as the subject is really one of high interest and importance, not merely from its connexion with the history of the country and the characters of some of our principal statesmen, but as involving and bringing into view all the great elementary questions in political science, we shall make no apology, although our remarks have already been protracted to a considerable length, for extending them a little farther, and adverting more particularly to some of the considerations which our author alleges in the way of reply to our preceding article.

The chief object which we had in view in that article,

was to defend the moral character of Mr. Jefferson against the imputations which were levelled against him, and we had no particular interest in determining the exact extent of his intellectual power. We had occasion, however, in the course of our remarks, to allude to a passage in one of the Lectures of Professor Cousin, in which he describes the elements of greatness, and we found that his idea of a great man was realized in the position occupied by Mr. Jefferson in the opinion of the American people. Our author is rather disposed on the whole, to concur in this view of his character, although he does it with apparent reluctance. 'There is a good deal of *Frenchness* in Cousin's explanation of greatness.' Mr. Cousin himself, 'though there is some reason to think him an intelligent man, may be suspected of being a lover of glory, and may have thought that such a one as Napoleon was a good procurer of the desired gratification.' That is, if we understand our author, Mr. Cousin may have arranged his definition of greatness so as to make it include Napoleon, for the purpose of paying court to the emperor, with a view of obtaining from him a retribution in *glory*. Truly our author is nearly as charitable in his construction of Mr. Cousin's writings as in that of Mr. Jefferson's conduct. On this head, however, we are happy to be able to remove his doubts. Mons. Cousin, who is now about forty years old, was of course about twenty when Napoleon took his departure for St. Helena. The lecture from which we extracted the passage in question, was delivered at Paris, in the year 1828. Under these circumstances, it is hardly probable that the professor intended to accommodate any part of it to the taste of the ex-emperor, who had then, been quietly reposing for several years in his island sepulchre.

Again, the definition of greatness given by Cousin, was not only accommodated to the taste of Napoleon, but is in itself questionable. 'Let us dare to differ from Mr. Cousin,' says our author, 'in the definition of a great man. To be truly great one must be good.' On this point we hope to be excused if we dare to differ from our author. As we understand the matter, greatness and goodness are two distinct things. The great man may or may not be good; the good man may or may not be great. The union of the highest intellectual and moral endowments would constitute the perfection of the human character, but those of either class may exist without as well as in connexion with those of the other. We endeav-

ored to show in our preceding article that Mr. Jefferson was a good man, and also that he occupied in the view of the American people, the position to which Professor Cousin attaches the notion of greatness; that he was for them a sort of personal representative of the principle of liberty. Napoleon, on the other hand, though he occupied a similar position of a still more commanding kind, on the continent of Europe; although he was unquestionably a great man, *s'il en fut jamais*, — although he was, *par excellence*, the great man of modern times, — had no pretension to the character of *goodness*. The two characters are, in short, essentially different. The good in a moral estimate of character are, in the language of Gray, 'far above the great,' but they are not therefore great, and the cause of goodness has nothing to gain by confounding natural distinctions and the corresponding forms of language.

Our author admits, though with some reluctance the intellectual superiority of Mr. Jefferson; 'we admit his superiority.' But how was it exhibited? In the Familiar Letters he was described as 'ruling the American people, by the magic of his pen.' In our preceding article we ventured to call this assertion in question; we stated that Mr. Jefferson wrote but little, that what he wrote, consisted chiefly of private letters, or public documents, and that there was no particular charm or power in his style. Our author, who seems to be as tenacious in sustaining the reputation of Mr. Jefferson, on the only point where he supposes us to have called it in question, as he is bent on destroying it, in regard to every other, construes these remarks into a disposition to depreciate his merit as a writer, and takes up the guantlet with a good deal of warmth in his favor. On this head, we must beg leave to set him right. We had no intention to depreciate the merit of Mr. Jefferson, as a writer, nor have we done so. We stated expressly on the contrary, that his writings, and particularly the Declaration of Independence, 'possessed the only literary merit, which could possibly belong to works of that class, that is, the total absence of all pretension to literary merit.' The class of subjects upon which he employed his pen, do not admit of the rhetorical embellishment, which constitutes the charm of a novel, or a poem. If the Declaration of Independence had been written in the style of the Last Days of Pompeii, it would have been recommitted, for the purpose of being taken into a new draft. In regard to the style of his writings, Mr. Jefferson showed a

very correct judgment, but it is certain, that a person who confines himself to the severe official manner, and hardly ever appears before the public, except in a state-paper, cannot, with propriety, be said to rule his countrymen by the magic of his pen. This is a description, which can only be applied with justice, to such men as Voltaire, Châteaubriand, Scott, Cobbett, and others, who acquire their influence over the public mind, by continual appeals through the press, and whose writings possess in different ways, a certain attraction, which secures to them the public attention, merely as the writings of such an author, without much regard to the subject. Although the writings of Mr. Jefferson had, as we said before, all the literary merit which the subjects he treated would admit, it is certain that he did not acquire, or maintain his influence over the American people in this way, and he therefore cannot be said with propriety to have ruled them, with the magic of his pen. Napoleon was, in like manner, a very good writer ; — so was Cæsar, one of the best of his time ; — so was Frederick the Great ; — so was Washington ; — a much better one, than the public have in general, been willing to admit ; superior we think, to Mr. Jefferson. But it would be thought idle, to assert that either of these great men ruled the people by the magic of his pen. It is equally so, in the case of Mr. Jefferson. He was a good writer, but he ruled the people, so far as he did rule them, by a very different sort of machinery.

‘How then,’ inquires our author, ‘did he exercise his influence ? If he neither fought battles, nor made speeches, if he wrote but little, excepting public documents, and private letters, how did the American people come to know of his superiority ?’ We answer, by his actions. Is there nothing to be done in the world, but fighting battles ? The firmness, consistency, and discretion, of Mr. Jefferson’s *conduct*, evinced at once his intellectual and moral superiority. They gave him at a very early period of his life, the lead among the patriots of his own commonwealth. When he came into Congress, the same qualities gave him, though the youngest member, a prominent position in that body. When he returned to Virginia, they recommended him to the people for the first executive office ; they afterwards recommended him to Congress, for the most important mission abroad, — to Washington, for the chief seat in his cabinet, — to his fellow-citizens throughout the country,

for the Presidency. Does our author suppose, that all this would have been accomplished by the aid of a merely literary talent, — the magic of the pen? Mr. Irving is one of the few persons whose pen is endowed with this same magic. Why does he not rule the American people? Why was he not governor of New York, at thirty? Why is he not president at this day? Let our author read the history of the life of Mr. Jefferson, which, from the tenor of his pamphlet, we are bound in charity to believe he has not yet read, and he will then see, in what way Mr. Jefferson exhibited his superiority and made it known to the American people. He did it by a series of labors, — labors which in these degenerate days would be considered Herculean, — and which, executed as they were by a gentleman of ample hereditary fortune, and the first social standing, gave to the people the best assurance they could possibly have, that he was at once able to serve them, and entitled to their confidence.

In our preceding article, after saying that there was no magic in Mr. Jefferson's pen, we added that his witchcraft lay, like that of the *Marcéhale* d'Ancre, in his mental superiority. In commenting on this remark our author represents us, as saying, that Mr. Jefferson exercised his influence over the American people, *through that sort of superiority which the Maréchal d'Ancre had*, and after giving at some length what he appears to consider as a history of this personage, and his family, concludes that 'the allusion is not very complimentary to Mr. Jefferson, or his party.' In this passage, our author, apparently from want of familiarity with the French language, has mistaken the person alluded to, who was not the *Maréchal* but the *Maréchale* d'Ancre, that is, Marshal d'Ancre's wife. Our allusion was to the well known noble reply of that unfortunate lady, when she was brought before a special commission of the French government on a charge of sorcery, founded in the favor which she was supposed to enjoy with the queen, and which in that superstitious age, it was thought could only have been acquired by supernatural arts. 'What charm have you employed,' said the presiding officer to her, 'to captivate in this way, her highness's affections?' 'The charm I used,' replied the indignant prisoner, 'was the power which a strong mind has over a weak one.' This answer, one of the boldest on record, and which resembles in dignity, the one given by the Duke de Montmorency, on a similar occasion, to which we have alluded

in another article, did not save the unhappy victim. Her real crime consisted in that very superiority which she alleged as a justification against the pretended charge of sorcery. She was convicted of witchcraft, *Judaism*, and malversation in office ; and publicly executed. In what way our allusion to this justly celebrated reply, in illustration of Mr. Jefferson's character, can be considered disrespectful to him, or his friends, our author can perhaps explain. In the mean time, we must be permitted to say, that his attempt to discredit the reputation of this unfortunate victim of popular prejudice, and courtly jealousy, for the purpose of throwing odium upon Mr. Jefferson, and us, is hardly consistent with the dictates of Christian charity.

We have said that the means by which Mr. Jefferson made himself known to the American people, and recommended himself to their favor, were his acts ; — his labors in the cause of his country, from the earliest period, up to the close of his life. Our author, who, as we have said before, does not appear to have read any connected history of the life of Jefferson, seems to doubt the truth of the common accounts of it. ' With respect to Mr. Jefferson's early actions in Virginia, we think it difficult at this day, to estimate their value. It is obvious that the Reviewer in this respect has merely transcribed Mr. Jefferson's own account. We do not find from examining the laws of Virginia, the evidence that any abridgment by Mr. Jefferson of the common law of England, was adopted in that state. Nor is it apparent, why any such labor was necessary. All the colonies had their local legislatures, which made from time to time, such laws as they needed ; and the only thing forced on the new republic, was to revise existing laws, and accommodate them to the new circumstances, and to make such new laws, as recently adopted constitutions required. In Massachusetts, the common law of England, as far as it was needed, had been in use from the earliest settlement. What, therefore, was intended, by an abridgment of the common law, for the use of Virginia, is not comprehended.'

Because our author cannot comprehend what is meant by an abridgment of the common law for the use of Virginia, or why any such work was necessary, it follows of course, that it was never executed. This attempt to dispute the most notorious historical facts, rather than allow Mr. Jefferson the credit of his own works, is at once an amusing, and a melancholy

proof of the extent to which political bigotry may be carried. On this subject, we beg leave to remark, in the first place, that we have said nothing of an abridgment of the common law. We said that Mr. 'Jefferson *digested* the whole common law of England, and the statutes, up to the time of James I., into bills ready for the action of the legislature, most of which have since been adopted, and now form the basis of the code of Virginia.' If our author would adopt the practice of quoting correctly, he would greatly improve his method of argument, and render himself a much more agreeable opponent. Secondly, in giving this description of Mr. Jefferson's labors, we did not transcribe his own account. Our author, when he has occasion to bear witness against his neighbor, should be careful that the witness so borne, is true. In writing the few sentences, upon this subject, which were contained in our preceding article, we employed Mr. Rayner's *Life of Jefferson*, in which the account of it occupies the greater part of the fifth and sixth chapters, and is founded mostly on public documents. Thirdly, the statement we made is sustained at every point by these documents and other matters of record.

The committee of the legislature of Virginia which performed the work in question, was appointed on motion of Mr. Jefferson, on the 24th of October, 1776, and consisted of himself, as chairman, and Messrs. Pendleton, Wythe, Mason, and Lee; they made their report on the 11th of June, 1779. Messrs. Mason and Lee had declined acting, and the whole labor had, in consequence, devolved on Messrs. Jefferson, Pendleton, and Wythe, who divided it among them in the following manner; the whole common law, and the statutes to the 4th of James I., when the separate legislation was established, to Mr. Jefferson; the British statutes from that period to the present day, to Mr. Wythe, and the Virginia laws to Mr. Pendleton. The report consisted of a hundred and twenty-six bills, making a folio volume of ninety pages. They were taken up separately, — some of them not till many years afterwards, but were most of them finally adopted.

'Such,' says Mr. Rayner, after giving a detailed account of the most important incidents, connected with this transaction, 'such are some of the innovations upon the established order, contained in the celebrated revised code of Virginia, of 1779, of which Mr. Jefferson was the author and draughtsman. It is difficult at the present day, to form an idea of this great po-

litical work, or of the genius and application it required. On the authority of Mr. Madison, we are enabled to say, "that it perhaps exceeded the severest of Mr. Jefferson's public labors." This magnificent undertaking was executed chiefly by himself during the short interval of three years.'

Of the very existence of this 'celebrated revised code,' of the reality of this 'magnificent undertaking,' our author professes to have as little knowledge as he has of the history of the Spanish Commoners. He never heard anything about it; he finds no evidence in the laws of Virginia, that any abridgment of the common law of England, by Mr. Jefferson, was ever adopted in that state; he does not comprehend that any such work was necessary; he does not believe that it was ever performed. What construction are we to put upon this extraordinary language?

We shall not attempt to follow our author through the long detail of objections to the administration of Mr. Jefferson, which he has again brought forward in this pamphlet. Our limits of course, forbid it, nor would such a discussion suit the purpose of the present occasion. Some of these objections had been concisely, but we trust distinctly answered, in our preceding article, as for example, that of acting under French influence. We remarked, that Mr. Jefferson and his friends no doubt sympathised with the liberal party in Europe, as long as it kept itself within the bounds of humanity and justice, but were so far from being under their influence, that the European liberalists acted to a very great extent under an influence produced by the example of this country, and that Mr. Jefferson himself had been, while in France, one of the chief personal agents, through whom the American influence had been exerted over the affairs of Europe. This account of the matter will be admitted by every fair-minded and impartial man, acquainted with the facts, to be the true one. It refutes of course, completely, the imputation of French influence. How does our author reply to it? By endeavoring to prove, with what success we have already seen, that the American revolution has had no influence upon subsequent events in Europe, and then, without further argument, very coolly inquiring, 'was, or was not, Mr. Jefferson devoted to one foreign nation, and adverse to all accommodation with another, and if so, what was his motive?' In answer to a mere repetition of the charge, without even a plausible attempt at proof, we need only refer to the language of our former article. 'Mr. Jefferson's object was

liberty. He and his friends sympathised in the feelings and general objects of the liberal party in Europe. The political and military movements of this party were led by France, and opposed by England. France was strenuously laboring for the accomplishment of the objects, which she considered most desirable, and England was strenuously opposing it. Under these circumstances, it was a matter of course, that he should wish for the success of France, and the failure of England; not that he cared anything for France, or England, as such, but that desiring the end, he naturally desired the means. Foreign influence takes place, when individuals or parties, from corrupt motives, espouse the interests of a foreign nation at the expense of that of their own. To wish, or to endeavor to promote the success of a nation, whose interests and objects you suppose at the time, to be identical with those of your own, is not a proof of foreign influence, but of patriotism, more or less enlightened, accordingly as the view you take of the subject is more or less correct.

In regard to this charge of *foreign influence*, our author should recollect, that it is a two-edged weapon which cuts more ways than one. If Mr. Jefferson and his friends sympathised, as every one knows that they did, with the liberal party in Europe, their opponents, the Federalists of that day, sympathised in like manner with the aristocratic, or as it is now called, legitimate or conservative party in Europe, — the party which, in order to avoid any epithet in the least degree offensive or even questionable, we have called the party of Law. How is this to be accounted for? No effect happens without some cause. The warm adherents of the liberal, or as it was then called, the Republican party, attributed the fact to corrupt British influence, to the employment of British gold; just as our author now attributes Mr. Jefferson's sympathy with the European friends of liberty to corrupt French influence. One of these charges was about as plausible, and probably just about as true as the other. But after all, the notorious fact, that a sympathy existed between the two great parties in Europe and the two great parties in the United States respectively, must in some way be accounted for. We have accounted for it in a manner honorable to both. We have stated that our domestic parties rejoiced in the successes and regretted the reverses of the corresponding parties in Europe, not from any corrupt or factious motives, but because they shared respectively the general views of these parties upon

the great political questions of the day. Our author rejects this theory in regard to Mr. Jefferson and his friends. Will he also reject it in regard to his own party? If so, what other will he substitute in its place, in order to avoid the imputations which he probably would not agree to, of corrupt British influence? Why, for example, did the Federalists of this State, after resolving in the legislature that it was unbecoming a moral and religious people to rejoice at victories obtained in an unjust war, join in a public festival to celebrate the victory of the Allies in 1813? No doubt because they thought the cause in which the Allies were engaged a just one: in other words, they agreed in opinion and sympathised in feeling with the latter on the great questions at issue between the two European parties. In this we are willing to believe that they were perfectly honest; but if our author is compelled to claim, and is ready to accept the benefit of this charitable construction for his own party, would it not be a little more decorous to allow that the great majority of the American people, including Mr. Jefferson, who agreed in opinion and sympathised in feeling with the liberal party in Europe, may also have been sincere? Is it less natural for Americans to sympathise with the cause of liberty, than with that of 'hereditary rights brought on by the events of former centuries?'

Nay, would doubtless be our author's reply, we and the legitimacy of Europe were in the right: Mr. Jefferson and the liberalism of Europe were in the wrong: and the case was so clear in our favor that it is impossible to suppose that our opponents could have acted from any other than corrupt motives. This is our author's argument reduced to its elements. *Il n'y a que moi qui ai toujours raison.* The only difficulty is, that it is equally strong on both sides of all possible questions. Mr. Jefferson had only to say that the case was so clear on his side, that his opponents must necessarily have acted from corrupt motives, and the Federalists were convicted at once of taking British gold.

'If Mr. Jefferson was devoted to one foreign nation, and adverse to all accommodation with another,' inquires our author, 'what were his motives?' Truly a pertinent question, and one to which we believe our author would be puzzled, on his view of the subject, to find an answer. The payments in gold were made, according to him, not to, but by Mr. Jefferson. In other cases, as in that of France and England in the time

of Charles II., one nation has exercised a corrupt influence over another, by bribing some of the principal men. But here the French corrupted Mr. Jefferson, not by paying money, but by receiving it from him. Mr. Jefferson, according to our author, gave Napoleon, through the hands of Mr. Monroe, two millions of dollars to *pacify* him. What a pity that Messrs. Jefferson and Monroe had not kept a few thousands out of the two millions to pacify their own creditors!

We perceive that this subject is fast outgrowing the limits of a moderate article, and shall only advert very hastily to two more topics, one on account of its importance and the other of its singularity.

The first is that of Nullification. This heresy is to be found, according to our author, in the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, supposed to have been written by Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Calhoun and the Carolina Nullifiers rely mainly upon these resolutions, and those of Virginia of the following year, drawn up by Mr. Madison, to sustain their system. Consequently, Mr. Jefferson was 'as certainly the author of Nullification as of the Declaration of Independence.'

In regard to this matter, there are two questions of some importance: first, is it true that the Kentucky Resolutions contain the doctrine of Nullification? Secondly, if the point be in some degree doubtful, is it politic to endeavor to give to this dangerous heresy the support of the great name and high authority of Mr. Jefferson?

As to the former, the fact relied on by our author is, that the 'third and fourth of the Kentucky Resolutions declare, that certain laws are no law, but altogether void and of no effect:— in other words, that they are unconstitutional. What then? Is there anything more common in this country than for legislative bodies and all other public meetings, to express their opinions upon the acts of the general or the state governments, — to say that this law is inexpedient, — that expedient; — this constitutional, — that null and void? Hardly a year passes in which the Legislature of Massachusetts do not in one way or another express some opinion upon the measures of the general government. Last year they condemned the removal of the depositories. The year before they denounced Nullification, and declared that Mr. Verplanck's bill, if it became a law, would justify forcible resistance to the government. This was more than saying that it would be null and void. Three years ago, they declared in so many words, in the resolves on

the North-Eastern Boundary, that any act of the general government, purporting to cede away the territory of a state, without the consent of such state previously obtained, would be null and void, and in no way binding upon the government or people of the state in question. This is precisely the language and tenor of the Kentucky Resolutions, which our author brings forward as containing the heresy of nullification. No one, we believe, ever thought of accusing the Legislature of Massachusetts, on account of these measures, of abetting or practising nullification. To express the opinion that an act of the general government is null, is not nullification, and this is all that was done by the Kentucky Resolutions. To nullify an act of the general government is to take measures (forcible if necessary) to prevent it from being carried into execution. This is the purpose of the Carolina ordinance. There lies the precise difference between the two measures, and we need not say that it goes the whole length of their moral character and tendency. To take forcible measures to prevent the execution of a law regularly enacted by the government is treason, and is punishable with death ; to express the opinion that a particular law is null, void and not binding, is a mere exercise of the freedom of thought and speech, which is secured to every citizen by the constitution and laws of this country.

We find, accordingly, that Mr. Madison, who has a right to know as much as any living person, about the true intent and meaning of the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, positively affirms that they contemplated no such thing as nullification. In a document which we had the honor of first introducing to public view, and which, though written at an advanced age, has been considered one of the most remarkable of his productions, he gives an explanation of the resolutions perfectly consistent with a just regard for the constitutional authority of the general government, and denounces, in the strongest terms, the extravagant pretensions of South Carolina. Is not the opinion of Mr. Madison entitled to at least as much weight in this matter, as that of Mr. Calhoun ?

Again ; were the meaning of these resolutions even more doubtful than it is ; and for ourselves we do not see that there is any doubt about it ; were it even admitted, — an admission for which we do not perceive a pretext, — that they lend some countenance to the doctrine of nullification, — would it be politic in our author as a friend of the Union and the constitution, — for such we presume he professes to be, —

to urge the point upon the public attention? It is quite natural that Mr. Calhoun and his friends should construe the resolutions in this way; — that they should endeavor to secure to their opinion the high authority and great influence of the name of Mr. Jefferson. It is not quite so natural that a professed opponent of nullification, should pursue the same line of argument, and lend them his aid in effecting their object. Whatever his motive may be, — and we are willing to believe, as we have repeatedly said, that it is a good one, — he could not do or say anything better fitted to promote the views and gratify the wishes of the Carolina statesmen.

Whether our author is himself entirely free from the heresy of nullification, might appear, from some passages in his pamphlet, a little doubtful. He says, among other things ‘that if the general government usurp power, which the constitution does not give, the states may undoubtedly take care of themselves; and that this would not be rebellion, sedition and civil war.’ It is no doubt true, that if the general government usurp power, the states may take care of themselves, — that is, may resist. But in the theory of the constitution, such resistance would be sedition, rebellion and civil war, and would be justifiable only as such, and under the natural right to resist extreme oppression. To say that in such a case resistance would be justifiable as a legal and constitutional measure, is precisely the South Carolina heresy.

We pass to the other point to which we intended to advert, chiefly on account of its singularity, and that is, the charge of *timidity*. Mr. Jefferson is represented by our author, not only as ambitious, mean, jealous and envious, but as ‘certainly *timid*.’ His timidity is supposed to have been the only reason why he did not overthrow the constitution, and usurp the government. ‘History,’ says our author, ‘is a mere fable, if he would not have made his will the law of the land, if opposition had not wrought upon his fears.’

When we recollect that the opposition to Mr. Jefferson was constantly diminishing, from the time of his election up to that of his retirement to private life, before which it had been reduced almost to nothing, we are at a loss to imagine what our author means by such an assertion, and really cannot even pretend to form a conjecture.

As to the general charge of timidity, we can only say, that we had hitherto supposed in the simplicity of our hearts, that the most plausible exception which could be

taken to the political course and character of Mr. Jefferson, was exactly the reverse of *timidity*. We have always considered him as one of the boldest of the statesmen of his time, and have attributed to this quality, in a considerable degree, his great success and influence. But it is the natural tendency of a prominent quality to run at times into excess, and we have thought that in some of Mr. Jefferson's proceedings, at all periods of his life, he might be fairly charged with this error. In his political course during the revolution ; — in his reform of the code of Virginia ; — he was uniformly in advance of the general sentiment of his fellow-patriots, and contemporaries. If he committed any faults, they were the result of intemperate and indiscreet zeal in the cause. In the general complexion of his political opinions in after life, which determined his position in the party controversies of the time, his failing, if he had any, was excessive violence. His principal measures,—the purchase of Louisiana, for example, and the embargo,—have often been objected to,—they are by our author, — as involving assumptions of power, never as indicating any want of boldness or decision.

We repeat, that we are entirely unable to conjecture what particular points in Mr. Jefferson's political conduct, our author could have intended, in making this charge. We are inclined to believe, that he must have had in his mind, some reminiscence of a supposed deficiency in personal courage, which formed a part of the staple of the ancient party warfare, upon the sage of Monticello, and which rested, we believe, substantially upon the celebrated adventure of the *Flight to Carter's mountain*. To relieve the dulness of a merely political discussion, and at the same time, give such of our readers as are not familiar with the controversies of former times, an amusing specimen of the materials, which were occasionally brought into use, we extract from Mr. Rayner's work, the brief account of this incident.

‘A few days after the expiration of Mr. Jefferson's constitutional term of office, and before the appointment of his successor, an incident occurred which has been so strangely misrepresented in later times, as to justify a relation of the details.

‘Learning that the general assembly was in session at Charlottesville, Cornwallis detached the ‘ferocious Tarlton,’ to proceed to that place, take the members by surprise, seize on the person of Mr. Jefferson, whom they supposed still in office, and spread devastation and terror on his route.

‘Elated with the idea of an enterprise so congenial to his disposition, and confident of an easy prey, Tarlton selected a competent body of men, and proceeded with ardor on his expedition. Early in the morning of June 4th, when within about ten miles of his destination, he detached a troop of horse under captain McLeod, to Monticello, the well-known seat of Mr. Jefferson; and proceeded himself with the main body, to Charlottesville, where he expected to find the legislature unapprised of his movement. The alarm, however, had been conveyed to Charlottesville, about sunrise the same morning, and thence quickly to Monticello, only three miles distant. The speakers of the two houses were lodging with Mr. Jefferson at his house. His guests had barely time to hurry to Charlottesville, adjourn the legislature to Staunton, and, with most of the other members, to effect their escape. He immediately ordered his carriage, in which Mrs. Jefferson and her children were conveyed to the house of Colonel Carter, on the neighboring mountain, while himself tarried behind, breakfasted as usual, and completed some necessary arrangements preparatory to his departure. Suddenly, a messenger, lieutenant Hudson, who had descried the rapid advance of the enemy, drove up at half speed, and gave him a second and last alarm; stating that the enemy were already ascending the winding road which leads to the summit of Monticello, and urging his immediate flight. He then calmly ordered his riding horse, which was shoeing at a neighboring blacksmith’s, directing him to be led to a gate opening on the road to colonel Carter’s whither he walked by a cross path, mounted his horse, and instead of taking the high road, plunged into the woods of the adjoining mountain and soon rejoined his family.

‘In less than ten minutes after Mr. Jefferson’s departure, his house was surrounded by the impetuous light-horse, thirsting for their prey. They entered the mansion with a flush of expectation proportioned to the value of their supposed victim; and, notwithstanding the chagrin and irritation which their disappointment excited, an honorable regard was manifested for the usages of enlightened nations at war. Mr. Jefferson’s property was respected, especially his books and papers, by the particular injunctions of McLeod.

‘This is the famous adventure of Carter’s mountain. Had the facts been accurately stated, it would have appeared that this favorite fabrication amounted to nothing more, than that Mr. Jefferson did not remain in his house, and there fight, single-handed, a whole troop of horse, — whose main body, too, was within supporting distance, — or suffer himself to be taken prisoner.’

Had the Governor of Virginia remained on this occasion in

his house, and permitted himself to be taken prisoner, to be afterward tried and executed as a rebel, he would probably have escaped the reproach of timidity : whether he would ever have obtained the title of the Sage of Monticello, is perhaps more doubtful.

In connexion with this anecdote it may perhaps be agreeable to some of our readers, to see the description given in the work before us, of Mr. Jefferson's residence. Monticello has lately, we believe, passed into the hands of Lieut. Levy.

'The agricultural operations of Mr. Jefferson were conducted upon an extensive scale, and consequently engaged a great share of his attention. The domains at Monticello, including the adjoining estates, contained about eleven thousand acres, of which about fifteen hundred were cleared. In addition to this he owned a large estate in Bedford county, by right of his wife, from which he raised annually about 40,000 weight of tobacco, and grain sufficient to maintain the plantation. He visited this estate, about seventy miles distant, once every year, which kept him from home six or seven weeks at a time. He had about two hundred negroes on his farms, who required a constant superintendence, more especially, under the peculiar system of agriculture which he pursued. But his choicest labors in this department, were bestowed on that delightful and beloved spot, where all his labors were to end, as they had been begun. He had reclaimed its ruggedness, when a very young man, and of its wilderness made a garden ; and now, in his old age, he returned to the farther development and improvement of its natural beauties.

'Monticello is derived from the Italian. It signifies 'little mountain,'—a modest title for an eminence, rising six hundred feet above the surrounding country, and commanding one of the most extensive and variegated prospects in the world. The base of the mountain, which is washed by the Ravanna, exceeds a mile in diameter ; and its sides are encompassed by four parallel roads, sweeping round it at equal distances, and so connected with each other by easy ascents as to afford, when completed, a level carriage way of almost seven miles. The whole mountain, with the exception of the summit, is covered with a dense and lofty forest. On the top is an elliptic plain of about ten acres, formed by the hand of art, cutting down the apex of the mountain. This extensive artificial level is laid out in a beautiful lawn, broken only by lofty weeping willows, poplars, acacias, catalpas, and other trees of foreign growth, distributed at such distances as not to obstruct the view from the centre in any direction. On the West, stretching away to the North and the South, the prospect is bounded

only by the Alleghanies, — a hundred miles distant in some parts, — overreaching all the intervening mountains, commanding a view of the Blue Ridge for a hundred and fifty miles, and looking down upon an enchanting landscape, broad as the eye can compass, of intermingling villages and deserts, forest and cultivation, mountains, valleys, rocks and rivers. On the East is a literal immensity of prospect, bounded only by the horizon, in which “nature seems to sleep in eternal repose.” From this grand point, bringing under the eye a most magnificent panorama, are overlooked, like pigmies, all the neighboring mountains as far as the Chesapeake. Here it was that the youthful philosopher, before the revolution, was wont to scrutinize the motions of the planets, with the revolutions of the celestial sphere; and to witness that phenomenon described in his Notes on Virginia, as among the sublimest of nature’s operations, the looming of the distant mountains. From this elevated seat he was wont to enjoy those scenes to which he reverted with so much fondness while in France: “And our own dear Monticello; where has nature spread so rich a mantle under the eye? — mountains, forests, rocks, rivers. With what majesty do we there ride above the storms! How sublime to look down into the workhouse of nature, to see her clouds, hail, snow, rain, thunder, all fabricated at our feet, and the glorious sun when rising as if out of a distant water, just gilding the tops of the mountains, and giving life to all nature.” From this proud summit, too, “the patriot,” in the language of a visitor, “could look down, with uninterrupted vision, upon the wide expanse of the world around, for which he considered himself born; and upward, to the open and vaulted heavens which he seemed to approach, as if to keep him continually in mind of his high responsibility. It is indeed a prospect in which you see and feel at once, that nothing mean or little could live. It is a scene fit to nourish those great and high-souled principles which formed the elements of his character, and ‘was a most noble and appropriate post for such a sentinel over the rights and liberties of man.’”

‘In the centre of this eminence rose the magnificent mansion of the patriarch. It was erected and furnished in the days of his affluence; and was such a one, in all respects, as became the character and fortune of the man. The main structure is one hundred feet in length, from East to West, and above sixty in depth, from North to South, presenting a front in every direction. The basement story is raised five or six feet above the ground, from which springs the principal story, above twenty feet in height, whereon rests an attic of about eight feet. The whole is surmounted by a lofty dome of twenty-eight feet in diameter, rising from the centre of the building. The principal front faces the East, and is adorned with a noble portico, balancing a correspond-

ing one on the West. The north and south fronts present arcades or piazzas, under which are cool recesses that open upon a floored terrace, projecting a hundred feet in a straight line, and then another hundred feet at right angles, until terminated by pavilions of two stories high. Under the whole length of these terraces is a range of one story buildings, in which are the offices requisite for domestic purposes, and the lodgings of the household servants. The exterior of the structure is finished in the Doric order complete, with balustrades on the top of it; the internal contains specimens of all the different orders, except the composite, which is not introduced. The hall is in the Ionic, the dining room in the Doric, the parlor in the Corinthian, and the dome in the Attic. Improvements and additions, both useful and ornamental, were continually going on, as they were suggested by the taste of the owner. Indeed, the whole building had been almost in a constant state of re-building, from its ante-revolutionary form, which was highly finished, to its present one; "and so I hope it will remain during my life," said he to a visitor, "as architecture is my delight, and putting up, and pulling down, one of my favorite amusements."

'On the declivities of the mountain were arranged the dwellings of artificers and mechanics of every description, and their work-shops; for it was the study of the illustrious proprietor to make himself perfectly independent. He had carpenters' blacksmiths' and cabinet-makers' shops, with manufactories for cottons and woollens, grain mills, sawing mills, and a nail factory conducted by boys. His carriage was made by his own workmen, as were also many articles of his fine furniture. The fabrication with his own hands of curious implements and models, was one of his favorite amusements.

'On entering the mansion by the east front, the visitor was ushered into a spacious and lofty hall, whose hangings announced at once the character and ruling passion of the man. On the right, on the left, and around his eye was struck with objects of science and taste. On one side were specimens of sculpture, in the form of statues and busts, disposed in such order, as to exhibit at one view the historical progress of the art, from the first rude attempts of the aborigines of our country, to the most finished models of European masters, including a bust of the patriot himself, from the hand of Caracci. Among others were the busts of a male and female sitting in the Indian position, supposed to be very ancient, having been ploughed up in Tennessee; a full length figure of Cleopatra, in a reclining position, after she had applied the asp; the busts of Voltaire and Turgot, in plaster. His own bust stood on a truncated column, on the pedestal of which were represented the twelve tribes of Israel, and the twelve signs of the Zodiac. On the other side of the hall were displayed a vast

collection of specimens of Indian art, their paintings, engravings, weapons, ornaments, manufactures, statues, and idols; and on another, a profusion of natural curiosities, prodigies of ancient art, and fossil productions of every description, mineral and animal. Among others were particularly noticed a model of the great pyramid of Egypt and the upper and lower jaw-bones and tusks of the mammoth, advantageously contrasted with those of an elephant.

‘From the hall the visitor entered a spacious saloon, through large folding doors. In this apartment, the walls were covered with the modern productions of the pencil, historical paintings of the most striking subjects from all countries, and all ages; scriptural paintings, among which are the ascension, the holy family, the scourging of Christ, and the crucifixion; the portraits of distinguished characters, both of Europe and America; with engravings, coins, and medallions in endless profusion. Here, and in the other rooms, were the portraits of Bacon, Newton, and Locke; of Columbus, Vespucci, Cortes, Magellan, Raleigh; of Franklin, Washington, La Fayette, Adams, Madison, Rittenhouse, Paine, and many other remarkable men. Here, too, were the busts of Alexander and Napoleon, placed on pedestals upon each side of the door of entrance.

‘The whole of the southern wing was occupied by the library, cabinet, and chamber of Mr. Jefferson. The library was divided into three apartments, opening into each other, the walls of which were covered with books and maps. It contained at one time the greatest private collection of books ever known in the United States, and incomparably the most valuable, from the multitude of rare works and the general superiority of the editions. He had been fifty years enriching and perfecting his assortment, omitting no pains, opportunities or expense. While in Paris he devoted every afternoon when he was disengaged, for a summer or two, in examining the principal bookstores, and putting by everything which related to America, with whatever was valuable in the sciences. Besides this he had standing orders, during the whole time he was in Europe, in its principal bookmarts, for all such works as could not be found in Paris. After the conflagration of Washington in the last war, and the destruction of the library, he sold about ten thousand volumes to the government, “to replace the devastations of British Vandalism.” Confiding in the honor of Congress, he made a tender of them to the government, at their own price. In his cabinet, he was surrounded with several hundred of his favorite authors, lying near at hand, with every accommodation and luxury which ease or taste could suggest. This apartment opened into a green-house, filled with a collection of rare plants; and he was seldom without some geranium or other plant beside him.

Connected with his study was an extensive apparatus for mathematical, philosophical, and optical purposes. It is supposed that no private gentleman in the world had in his possession so perfect and complete a scientific, useful, and ornamental collection as Mr. Jefferson.

‘Such is an imperfect representation of a patriarchal seat and appendages, whose just celebrity has attracted the wayfarer of every land. But who shall describe its great architect and occupant? Let this duty be discharged by adopting the record of a distinguished guest.

“While the visitor was yet lost in the contemplation of these treasures of the arts and sciences, he was startled by the approach of a strong and sprightly step, and turning with instinctive reverence to the door of entrance, he was met by the tall, and animated, and stately figure of the patriot himself, — his countenance beaming with intelligence and benignity, and his outstretched hand, with its strong and cordial pressure, confirming the courteous welcome of his lips. And then came that charm of manner and conversation that passes all description, — so cheerful, — so unassuming, — so free, and easy, and frank, and kind, and gay, — that even the young, and overawed, and embarrassed visitor at once forgot his fears, and felt himself by the side of an old and familiar friend. There was no effort, no ambition in the conversation of the philosopher. It was as simple and unpretending as nature itself. And while in this easy manner he was pouring out instruction, like light from an inexhaustible solar fountain, he seemed continually to be asking, instead of giving information. The visitor felt himself lifted by the contact, into a new and nobler region of thought, and became surprised at his own buoyancy and vigor. He could not, indeed, help being astounded, now and then, at those transcendent leaps of the mind, which he saw made without the slightest exertion, and at the ease with which this wonderful man played with subjects which he had been in the habit of considering among the *argumenta crucis* of the intellect. And then there seemed to be no end to his knowledge. He was a thorough master of every subject that was touched. From the details of the humblest mechanic art, up to the highest summit of science, he was perfectly at his ease, and everywhere at home. There seemed to be no longer any *terra incognita* of the human understanding: for, what the visitor had thought so, he now found reduced to a familiar garden walk; and all this carried off so lightly, so playfully, so gracefully, so engagingly, that he won every heart that approached him, as certainly as he astonished every mind.”

It is time, however, to bring this article to a close. We have considered it a duty to endeavor, within the narrow sphere

of our influence, to rescue from unmerited obloquy the memory of one of the great fathers of our country. A full exposition of the principles and political course of Mr. Jefferson, belongs to the history of the Union, and could not be brought within the compass of an article like this. We trust that we have said enough to indicate the general considerations that come into view in forming a judgment upon his character. It is idle to attempt to separate the prominent actors in the revolutions that change the face of the world, from the causes in which they were engaged. Of what consequence is it to the fame of Luther, whether he did or did not contend single-handed, as he says, in personal conflict with the incarnate principle of Evil, and throw an inkstand at his head? His reputation must be settled not by a transient, optical or mental illusion, but by the labors of his life, the results of the reformation. Mr. Jefferson, in like manner, will stand or fall in the opinion of impartial posterity, according to the opinion that may be formed of the character of the great intellectual and social movement of the age, — a movement that commenced, as we have said, with the preaching of Luther, and continued through the British and American revolutions, until it extended itself within our time to France, and thence throughout the whole Christian world. In this movement Mr. Jefferson was in his day and within his sphere, one of the most conspicuous actors. If it shall appear in its results, as those who now approve it, fondly hope, to have been a *regeneration* of the political condition of Europe and America, Mr. Jefferson with its other promoters will be considered as a great benefactor of the human race. If it shall appear, as its enemies believe, and many timid and doubtful persons fear, to have been the *dissolution* instead of the regeneration of society, Mr. Jefferson will be classed among the well-meaning but mistaken zealots, who verily think they are doing God some direct service, when they are in reality executing his judgments upon offending man. In either event he can never lose the credit of the high intellectual superiority which ensured him, in his day, the enthusiastic confidence of his countrymen, and rendered him for them, as it were, the personified *Spirit of the Age*. The baseless imputations of French influence, hostility to commerce, and the other still less plausible inventions of party spirit, will be seen by the future historian to carry their own refutation with them and will be left by him in silence, where

he finds them, in the pamphlets, newspapers and familiar letters of the time.

‘Why,’ asks our author, ‘should this matter be the subject of inquiry?’ When the reputation of one of the principal ornaments of our history is attacked, it follows of course, that he must be defended. But why was the attack made? Our author believes that ‘the opinions and political practice of Mr. Jefferson, had, and still have, an influence on the affairs of this country, which is inconsistent with liberty, as defined by law.’ This belief we consider as a mere illusion of party spirit, but supposing our author to be honest in it, we cannot of course blame him for acting upon it. The *policy* of making the attack at this time, is perhaps more doubtful. We take no part as conductors of this journal, in the party controversies of the day, but we may fairly employ the *argumentum ad hominem* in reference to any citizen who does. Our author is understood to be a somewhat conspicuous member of the party opposed to the present administration of the general government. The party who support the administration claim as a title of honor to be the followers of Mr. Jefferson, and the representatives of his principles; they consider their cause as gained before the people, if they can identify it with him. Now our author, one of the strongest opponents of the administration, comes forward with an elaborate work, and subsequently a pamphlet, intended to prove that the adherents of the present administration are, in fact, as they say they are, the followers and disciples of Mr. Jefferson, — that their principles are his principles, — their feelings his feelings, — their cause his cause. May not the friends of the administration justly exclaim with the ancient patriarch, ‘Oh! that mine enemy had written a book?’ May not its opponents properly say in the language of the Spanish proverb, — ‘Save me from my friends, and I will save myself from my enemies?’

Among the extracts printed on the title-page, is a passage from one of Cicero’s Orations, which our author probably intended to apply to his own case, and in which the orator remarks, that far from expecting to gain favor with the public, by the proceedings in which he was then engaged, he was well aware, that he should draw upon himself many enmities, some secret, and some open, without advantage, in the attempt to do the state some service. That our author is willing to encounter personal inconvenience in the public service,

as he perhaps erroneously understands it, is honorable to him. The misfortune is, that with the best intentions in the world, it is not in his power to concentrate upon his own head all the open and secret enmities, that have been, and will be roused, by this attack on the fame of Mr. Jefferson. It is easy to throw about fire-brands, but it is not easy for the person so doing to say with certainty, that his own house shall be the only, or the most valuable one, that may be sacrificed in the sport. Publications that are issued by conspicuous members of a political party, especially in times of high excitement, are considered and represented, as expressing the opinions of the party as well as the individual author, nor can any *disclaimer* entirely remove the impression. It is of little importance to the friends of the administration, what may be the opinion of our author, upon the character of Mr. Jefferson, — but it is of considerable importance to them, to have some plausible pretext for representing other persons, more conspicuous in the eye of the nation, more formidable in the wars of party, as hostile to republican principles. Such a pretext they find in works like the Familiar Letters, and the pamphlet now before us. They have accordingly been used, with effect, for the purpose alluded to, and will continue to be so employed in future. One object which we have had in view, in this and our preceding article, has been to endeavor to counteract this operation of our author's writings, and to show that his bitter prejudices against the principles and character of Mr. Jefferson, are not generally entertained by intelligent men, in this quarter of the country. We believe, as we remarked before, that we have expressed in these articles, the almost unanimous sentiment of the active men of the present generation. But we are aware, that the antidote cannot, under the circumstances, be co-extensive in its effect, with the bane, and that our author, without affecting, in the slightest degree, the present or future standing of Mr. Jefferson in public opinion, has done to his own political friends and associates, a mischief of no trifling extent, and one in its nature irremediable.

All that can be said farther, in the way of remedy, is to add to the considerations which we have now urged, and which, proceeding from us, can claim no weight, except such as they may derive from their intrinsic truth and justice, the authority of one of the highest, and most respected names in New-England. We shall accordingly con-

clude this article, by an extract from the eulogy pronounced by Mr. Webster, at the joint commemoration of the deaths of Adams and Jefferson. Our readers will perceive, that it confirms in every particular, and in some with a striking coincidence in the train of thought, the view that we have given of the character, principles, and political course of the latter of these two patriots in this, and our preceding article. It would be easy to multiply extracts to the same effect, from the writings of a large proportion of the most distinguished men in the country, but our limits will not permit it, and the name we employ is sufficient for the purpose of authority and evidence. The testimony of Mr. Webster is the unbiassed, spontaneous tribute of one great man, to the merit and services of another, from whom he had been separated by the party divisions of the times. It is highly and equally honorable to the characters of both.

‘ Mr. Jefferson appears to have been imbued with an early love of letters and science, and to have cherished a strong disposition to pursue these objects. To the physical sciences, especially, and to ancient classic literature, he is understood to have had a warm attachment, and never entirely to have lost sight of them, in the midst of the busiest occupations. But the times were times for action, rather than for contemplation. The country was to be defended, and to be saved, before it could be enjoyed. Philosophic leisure and literary pursuits, and even the objects of professional attention, were all necessarily postponed to the urgent calls of the public service. The exigency of the country made the same demand on Mr. Jefferson, that it made on others who had the ability and the disposition to serve it ; and he obeyed the call ; thinking and feeling, in this respect, with the great Roman orator ; *Quis enim est tam cupidus in perspicienda cognoscendaque rerum natura, ut, si ei tractanti contemplantique res cognitione dignissimas subito sit allatum periculum discrimenque patrie, cui subvenire opitularique possit, non illa omnia relinquat atque abjiciat, etiam si dinumerare se stellas, aut metiri mundi magnitudinem posse arbitretur ?*

‘ Entering, with all his heart, into the cause of liberty, his ability, patriotism, and power with the pen naturally drew upon him a large participation in the most important concerns. Wherever he was, there was found a soul devoted to the cause, power to defend and maintain it, and willingness to incur all its hazards. In 1774 he published a Summary View of the Rights of British America, a valuable production among those intended to show the dangers which threatened the liberties of the country, and to encourage the people in their defence. In June 1775 he

was elected a member of the Continental Congress, as successor to Peyton Randolph, who had retired on account of ill health, and took his seat in that body on the 21st of the same month.

‘It has sometimes been said, as if it were a derogation from the merits of this paper, that it contains nothing new; that it only states grounds of proceeding, and presses topics of argument, which had often been stated and pressed before. But it was not the object of the declaration to produce anything new. It was not to invent reasons for independence, but to state those which governed the Congress. For great and sufficient causes, it was proposed to declare independence; and the proper business of the paper to be drawn, was to set forth those causes, and justify the authors of the measure, in any event of fortune, to the country, and to posterity. The cause of American independence, moreover, was now to be presented to the world, in such manner, if it might so be, as to engage its sympathy, to command its respect, to attract its admiration; and in an assembly of most able and distinguished men, Thomas Jefferson had the high honor of being the selected advocate of this cause. To say that he performed his great work well, would be doing him injustice. To say that he did it excellently well, admirably well, would be inadequate and halting praise. Let us rather say, that he so discharged the duty assigned him, that all Americans may well rejoice that the work of drawing the title-deed of their liberties devolved on his hands.*

‘Mr. Jefferson, having been occupied in the years 1778 and 1779, in the *important service of revising the laws of Virginia*, was elected governor of that State, as successor to Patrick Henry, and held the situation when the State was invaded by the British arms. In 1781 he published his *Notes on Virginia*, a work which attracted attention in Europe as well as America, dispelled many misconceptions respecting this Continent, and gave its author a place among men distinguished for science. In November 1783, he again took his seat in the Continental Congress, but in the May following was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary, to act abroad, in the negotiation of commercial treaties, with Dr. Franklin and Mr. Adams. He proceeded to France, in execution of this mission, embarking at Boston; and that was the only occasion on which he ever visited this place. In 1785 he was appointed minister to France, the duties of which situation he continued to perform, until October 1789, when he obtained leave to

* Mr. H. Lee differs from Mr. Webster upon this subject. In his *Observations on the writings of Mr. Jefferson*, he says that the Declaration ‘exhibits none of the higher powers of composition, and though suited to the great occasion was not equal to it.’ p. 116.

retire, just on the eve of that tremendous Revolution which has so much agitated the world, in our times. Mr. Jefferson's discharge of his diplomatic duties was marked by great ability, diligence, and patriotism; and while he resided at Paris, in one of the most interesting periods, his character for intelligence, his love of knowledge, and of the society of learned men, distinguished him in the highest circles of the French capital. *No court in Europe had, at that time, in Paris, a representative commanding or enjoying higher regard, for political knowledge or for general attainment, than the minister of this then infant republic.* Immediately on his return to his native country, at the organization of the government under the present Constitution, his talents and experience recommended him to President Washington, for the first office in his gift. He was placed at the head of the Department of State. In this situation, also, he manifested conspicuous ability. His correspondence with the ministers of other powers residing here, and his instructions to our own diplomatic agents abroad, are among our ablest State Papers. A thorough knowledge of the laws and usages of nations, perfect acquaintance with the immediate subject before him, great felicity, and still greater facility, in writing, show themselves in whatever effort his official situation called on him to make. It is believed, by competent judges, that the diplomatic intercourse of the government of the United States, from the first meeting of the Continental Congress in 1774 to the present time, taken together, would not suffer, in respect to the talent with which it has been conducted, by comparison with anything which other and older states can produce; and to the attainment of this respectability and distinction, Mr. Jefferson has contributed his full part.

‘On the retirement of General Washington from the presidency, and the election of Mr. Adams to that office, in 1797, he was chosen Vice-President. While presiding, in this capacity, over the deliberations of the senate, he compiled and published a Manual of Parliamentary Practice, a work of more labor and merit, than is indicated by its size. It is now received, as the general standard, by which proceedings are regulated, not only in both Houses of Congress, but in most of the other legislative bodies in the country. In 1801, he was elected President, in opposition to Mr. Adams, and re-elected in 1805, by a vote approaching towards unanimity.

‘From the time of his final retirement from public life, in 1808, Mr. Jefferson lived, as became a wise man. Surrounded by affectionate friends, his ardor in the pursuit of knowledge undiminished, with uncommon health, and unbroken spirits, he was able to enjoy largely the rational pleasures of life, and to partake in that public prosperity, which he had so much contributed to

produce. His kindness and hospitality, the charm of his conversation, the ease of his manners, the extent of his acquirements, and especially the full store of revolutionary incidents, which he possessed, and which he knew when and how to dispense, rendered his abode in a high degree attractive to his admiring countrymen, while his high public and scientific character drew towards him every intelligent and educated traveller from abroad. Both Mr. Adams and Mr. Jefferson had the pleasure of knowing that the respect, which they so largely received, was not paid to their official stations. *They were not men made great by office; but great men, on whom the country for its own benefit had conferred office.* There was that in them, which office did not give, and which the relinquishment of office did not, and could not, take away. In their retirement, in the midst of their fellow-citizens, themselves private citizens, they enjoyed as high regard and esteem, as when filling the most important places of public trust.

‘There remained to Mr. Jefferson yet one other work of patriotism and beneficence, the establishment of a university in his native state. To this object he devoted years of incessant and anxious attention, and by the enlightened liberality of the legislature of Virginia, and the co-operation of other able and zealous friends, he lived to see it accomplished. May all success attend this infant seminary; and may those who enjoy its advantages, as often as their eyes shall rest on the neighboring height, recollect what they owe to their disinterested and indefatigable benefactor; and may letters honor him who thus labored in the cause of letters!

‘Thus useful, and thus respected, passed the old age of Thomas Jefferson. But time was on its ever-ceaseless wing, and was now bringing the last hours of this illustrious man. He saw its approach, with undisturbed serenity. He counted the moments, as they passed, and beheld that his last sands were falling. That day, too, was at hand, which he had helped to make immortal. One wish, one hope, — if it were not presumptuous, — beat in his fainting breast. Could it be so, — might it please God, — he would desire, once more to see the sun, — once more to look abroad on the scene around him, on the great day of liberty. Heaven, in its mercy, fulfilled that prayer. He saw that sun, — he enjoyed its sacred light, — he thanked God, for this mercy, and bowed his aged head to the grave. “*Felix, non vitæ tantum claritate, sed etiam opportunitate mortis.*”

‘The last public labor of Mr. Jefferson naturally suggests the expression of the high praise which is due, both to him and to Mr. Adams, for their uniform and zealous attachment to learning, and to the cause of general knowledge. Of the advantages of

learning, indeed, and of literary accomplishments, their own characters were striking recommendations, and illustrations. They were scholars, ripe and good scholars; widely acquainted with ancient, as well as modern literature, and not altogether uninstructed in the deeper sciences. Their acquirements, doubtless, were different, and so were the particular objects of their literary pursuits; as their tastes and characters, in these respects, differed like those of other men. Being, also, men of busy lives, with great objects, requiring action, constantly before them, their attainments in letters did not become showy, or obtrusive. Yet, I would hazard the opinion, that if we could now ascertain all the causes which gave them eminence and distinction, in the midst of the great men with whom they acted, we should find, not among the least, their early acquisitions in literature, the resources which it furnished, the promptitude and facility which it communicated, and the wide field it opened, for analogy and illustration; giving them, thus, on every subject, a larger view, and a broader range, as well for discussion, as for the government of their own conduct.

‘As the promotion of knowledge had been the object of their regard through life, so these great men made it the subject of their testamentary bounty. Mr. Jefferson is understood to have bequeathed his library to the university, and that of Mr. Adams is bestowed on the inhabitants of Quincy.

‘Mr. Adams, and Mr. Jefferson, fellow-citizens, were successively Presidents of the United States. The comparative merits of their respective administrations for a long time agitated and divided public opinion. They were rivals, each supported by numerous and powerful portions of the people, for the highest office. This contest, partly the cause, and partly the consequence, of the long existence of two great political parties in the country, is now part of the history of our government. We may naturally regret, that anything should have occurred to create difference and discord, between those who had acted harmoniously and efficiently in the great concerns of the revolution. But this is not the time, nor this the occasion, for entering into the grounds of that difference, or for attempting to discuss the merits of the questions which it involves. As practical questions, they were canvassed, when the measures which they regarded were acted on and adopted; and as belonging to history, the time has not come for their consideration.

‘It is, perhaps, not wonderful, that when the Constitution of the United States went first into operation, different opinions should have been entertained, as to the extent of the powers conferred by it. Here was a natural source of diversity of sentiment. It is still less wonderful, that that event, almost contemporary with

our government, under the present Constitution, which so entirely shocked all Europe, and disturbed our relations with her leading powers, should have been thought, by different men, to have different bearings on our own prosperity ; and that the early measures, adopted by our government, in consequence of this new state of things, should have been seen in opposite lights. It is for the future historian, when what now remains of prejudice and misconception shall have passed away, to state these different opinions, and pronounce impartial judgment. In the meantime, all good men rejoice, and may well rejoice, that the sharpest differences sprung out of measures, which, whether right or wrong, have ceased, with the exigencies that gave them birth, and have left no permanent effect, either on the Constitution, or on the general prosperity of the country. This remark, I am aware, may be supposed to have its exception, in one measure, the alteration of the Constitution, as to the mode of choosing the President ; but it is true, in its general application. Thus the course of policy pursued towards France, in 1798, on the one hand, and the measures of commercial restriction, commenced in 1807, on the other, both subjects of warm and severe opposition, have passed away, and left nothing behind them. They were temporary, and whether wise or unwise, their consequences were limited to their respective occasions. It is equally clear, at the same time, and it is equally gratifying, that those measures of both administrations, which were of durable importance, and which drew after them interesting and long remaining consequences, have received general approbation. Such was the organization, or rather the creation, of the navy, in the administration of Mr. Adams ; such the acquisition of Louisiana, in that of Mr. Jefferson. The country, it may safely be added, is not likely to be willing either to approve, or to reprobate, indiscriminately, and in the aggregate, all the measures of either, or of any, administration. The dictate of reason and of justice is, that, holding each one his own sentiments on the points in difference, we imitate the great men themselves, in the forbearance and moderation which they have cherished, and in the mutual respect and kindness which they have been so much inclined to feel and to reciprocate.

‘ No men, fellow-citizens, ever served their country with more entire exemption from every imputation of selfish and mercenary motives, than those to whose memory we are paying these proofs of respect. A suspicion of any disposition to enrich themselves, or to profit by their public employments, never rested on either. No sordid motive approached them. The inheritance which they have left to their children, is of their character and their fame.

‘ Fellow-citizens, I will detain you no longer by this faint and feeble tribute to the memory of the illustrious dead. Even in

other hands, adequate justice could not be performed, within the limits of this occasion. Their highest, their best praise, is your deep conviction of their merits, your affectionate gratitude for their labors and services. It is not my voice, it is this cessation of ordinary pursuits, this arresting of all attention, these solemn ceremonies, and this crowded house, which speak their eulogy. Their fame, indeed, is safe. That is now treasured up, beyond the reach of accident. Although no sculptured marble should rise to their memory, nor engraved stone bear record of their deeds, yet will their remembrance be as lasting as the land they honored. Marble columns may, indeed, moulder into dust;—time may erase all impress from the crumbling stone;—but their fame remains;—for with AMERICAN LIBERTY it rose, and with AMERICAN LIBERTY ONLY can it perish. It was the last swelling peal of yonder choir, “THEIR BODIES ARE BURIED IN PEACE, BUT THEIR NAME LIVETH EVERMORE.” I catch that solemn song; I echo that lofty strain of funeral triumph, “THEIR NAME LIVETH EVERMORE.”

ART. XI. — *Calavar.*

Calavar: or the Knight of the Conquest; a Romance of Mexico. 2 Vols. 12mo. Philadelphia. 1834.

MANY of our writers have insisted, that the scenery and history of the regions of this hemisphere abound in materials for romance, not at all inferior to any that the old world has to show; but the author of this work has done still better; he has given us a practical illustration of the argument, which reflects credit on his own ability, and does no dishonor to the literature of his country. If there is any portion of modern history, fertile in romantic and exciting interest, it is that of the conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards. Many and dark are the shadows that hang over the narration; it is blackened by revenge and avarice, and degraded by foul and revolting crime: yet, strange as it may appear, this remarkable enterprise, like those of the Crusaders of an earlier age, was almost wholly the offspring of religious zeal; of that religious zeal, however, which employs the ministry of fire and sword, to gather in the heathen beneath the banner of the cross. It was ennobled by the exhibition, in their most impos-